DT
351
.S9Q56
1890
AFA

Smithsonian
Institution
Libraries

From the
RUSSELL E. TRAIN
AFRICANA COLLECTION

1890.

£9s

[Extract from the Journal
Society, VOL. VIII. No. 31]

[1890?]

TF 12047
.B3

Mary Whittier

With the Authors
Love.

Nov. 1890.

DT
351
S9
Q56
1890
SCNHOW

# Mr. H. M. Stanley: as Leader and Comrade

'VILLA VICTORIA, CAIRO, *April*, 1890.

'DEAR SIR,—

'* * * I greatly regret that I can do no more than assert my perfect belief that every thought that animated your son was for the well-being and success of the enterprise for which he had volunteered; and I do not think that there is one man out of 10,000 living who, after resolving to discover what persuasion could effect with Tippu Tib, would have done otherwise than persevere in the attempt; and none possessing the zeal and ardour and passion for work which distinguished your son could possibly have evaded the fate which overtook him. However erring the conception of his duty, his companions concurred in it, and he, being the responsible chief, suffered while performing what he and they considered to be his duty. I have the satisfaction of remembering that during our acquaintance, and when we parted at Yambuya, we lived as friends, and separated as such; and I only regret that I could not have been 28 days earlier, to have rescued a young fellow whose heart, I shall always believe, was in the right place.* * *

'Yours most faithfully, (Signed) H. M. STANLEY.'

*Extract of Letter to Sir Walter Barttelot, Bart.*

'Good night, oh! my companions! May honours such as you deserve be showered upon you. To the warm hearts of your countrymen I consign you. Should one doubt be thrown upon your manhood, or upon your loyalty or honour, within these pages, the record of your faithfulness during a period which I doubt will ever be excelled for its gloom and hopelessness, will be found to show with what noble fortitude you bore all.'—(H. M. Stanley, p. 431, vol. ii. 'Darkest Africa.')

FEW things are less gracious, and, under ordinary circumstances, less excusable, than the attempt to take away from any man who has undergone unusual perils and surmounted vast difficulties, any portion of the honour which has been publicly bestowed upon him. It is felt, and rightly, that much may be excused to such an one if in distress or danger, or in the encounter with difficulty, his actions have been those which were most available and useful for the needs of the moment, rather than such as would be inculcated in Sunday schools, or approved of by Dorcas societies. All those who have had anything to do with the management of large bodies of men, and who have been responsible for their safety and guidance as well as their effectiveness, know that there are many occasions when the ruler must, so to speak, take off his kid gloves and use the iron hand of discipline and authority, no matter how really tender may be his heart, or how regretful his feelings. 'It is little use,' says a slangy but not uninstructive proverb, 'to squirt rose-water at an iron-clad,' and in the conduct of expeditions, as in the cutting down of trees, the blows must sometimes fall thick and heavy, and occasionally blood must be shed without too much concern. Acts which are cowardly in themselves—such as the firing at naked savages from a

safe distance with Winchester repeating rifles, or burning the villages and destroying the crops which give those savages shelter and subsistence, are yet excused by practical men, or if not excused, relegated to the catalogue of sad, unavoidable necessity, when they have been done to ensure the safety, or forward the progress of an expedition which would otherwise have failed.

For we must not be too curious as to the colour of the hands which bring gifts of knowledge or help the spread of civilization: all that we are entitled to ask being that the successful explorer or discoverer should deal faithfully with his comrades, and honestly with his employers, should fulfil the objects for which he has received help and authority, and should give due honour and reward to those who have assisted him in the conduct of his enterprise. Errors of haste, errors of morality, errors of taste and temper, errors even of boastfulness, self-glorification, and a keen eye to personal interest, may well be forgiven to and forgotten in the man who takes his life in his hands for some worthy object, and pushes through to a successful conclusion enterprises of unusual daring and privation, which he alone perchance is able to render successful. The truth of these considerations has never been more clearly exemplified than in the records of Mr. H. M. Stanley's African explorations.

There are few of us who are acquainted with his earlier books, and who have cared to follow intelligently not only what they say, but what they imply, who feel inclined to sanction, save on some such plea as the above, Mr. Stanley's habitual conduct towards the natives with whom he came in contact; and there is perhaps no modest or honourable Englishman who has not felt a touch of shame in reading these narratives at the boastfulness and arrogance of the writer, and at the peculiarly unpleasant mixture of journalistic exaggeration, unscrupulous dealing, and religious sentiment which characterise Mr. Stanley's actions as they are depicted in Mr. Stanley's own words.

The records of African travel, which happily is only another name for African heroism, were pretty full before Mr. Stanley's arrival, and have been continued since by many another intrepid and self-sacrificing explorer; but the story of such achievements has never, to the best of our belief, been told in such King Cambyses' vein, nor have the explorers demanded so persistently rewards so great, or advertised their achievements in so exhaustive a manner. However, the age is one of self-advertisement, and not too fastidious a taste, and Mr. Stanley might doubtless have gone on to the end shoving his own conception of himself,

DSI

successfully down the throats of the English people with general applause and popularity, if his deficiencies had only consisted in such matters as the above. In truth it was no one's business to care much how unknown cannibal tribes in the interior of Africa were treated or question the accounts rendered by Mr. Stanley of his actions; what people did care for was, not the manner in which he told his story, but the fact of his having it to tell at all. The old English admiration for courage and hardihood covered in this instance, like charity, a multitude of sins, and men who were most opposed to his vulgarity, and swagger growled out nevertheless at the club to one another, 'I suppose he's a plucky beggar; confound him!'; which is, in club language, high praise. But when Mr. Stanley extended his prerogatives, from simple boastfulness at home and unscrupulousness abroad, to neglecting the safety of his officers while living, and attacking their reputation when dead; when it became a matter of public suspicion whether he had not misled the entire English public by gaining their assistance and applause for one philanthropic enterprise when he was chiefly concerned for projects commercial, political, and personal; when he was said to have taken captive the man he was sent to relieve; when, lying under the stigma of such accusations, he had no reply save insinuations of the most shadowy and horrible character against the dead men who had served him; and leaving his accusers unanswered, and his conduct unexplained, he took ship for America, to repeat on his lecturing tour the tale of that expedition with regard to which his *bonâ fides* had been so severely challenged; I think there were few of us who did not feel inclined to let our judgments go by default, so unworthy of a gentleman and an honest man did such conduct appear.

The tactic of the manœuvre was sufficiently obvious. No one knows better than Mr. Stanley how evanescent is popular interest in any given subject, and he might well expect that with his own book securely established in public favour the revelations of Major Barttelot's diaries would, within a very short time, cease to be remembered, and from their purely personal interest fade from the public view. Nothing is more tiring than an old accusation, no matter how veritable it may be, to every one save the accuser. 'Oh! that's an old story,' do we not often hear said as a sufficient answer to some very possibly well-grounded charge.

Few people can appreciate, fewer still sift evidence, and fewest of all perhaps will take the trouble to do either when there is a consensus of ready-made opinion which is to be had for the asking. It may well be

that Mr. Stanley was right, and that by the time he returns, his treatment of the late Major Barttelot and Mr. James Jameson will be forgotten; but there are few signs of such being the case, and what little the present writer can do to prevent its taking place, he has endeavoured to do in this article, by setting down as plainly as possible the facts of the case abstracted from all irrelevant detail.

The case for Mr. Stanley is stated at great length, in telling journalistic fashion, and with abundant surrounding of pious and high-souled moral reflection in Mr. Stanley's own work of 'Darkest Africa.'[1] The case for Messrs. Jameson and Barttelot is set down with no such attractive surrounding, but in simple almost schoolboy language in which the bald facts appear unadorned and instinct in their very ruggedness with the accents of truth and honour, in their private diaries.[2] In addition to these there is on Mr. Stanley's side the extremely careful, clever, and well-edited work of Mr. Jephson, prefaced by Mr. Stanley himself, and indeed undertaken with his 'revision and co-operation.' On the side of the ill-fated officers there is also the testimony of Mr. Ward and Lieutenant Troup, and indirectly, as showing the motives which actuated Mr. Stanley, the testimony of Emin Pasha, Dr. Peters, and others. To these sources I have gone at first-hand to ascertain, if possible, the exact facts of the case. No statement is, to the best of my belief, made in the following paper without its authority being given. The reader is asked to accept nothing on hearsay evidence.

If the case on behalf of Mr. Stanley is still incomplete, it must be remembered that it is so by his own wish and owing to his own action. He it was who brought the accusations against Messrs. Barttelot and Jameson four months since—brought them knowing that the men were dead, and knowing that by the terms of their contract with him their lips would be sealed in death as in life for months to come. Those months have now passed, and through his book one of the dead men has unconsciously spoken in answer to the carefully-formulated charge of his late leader. What it is that has been said, and what intrinsic evidence of the truth of Major Barttelot's words is to be found in the reports of his comrades, and in Mr. Stanley's own book, are matters which I shall endea-

[1] In the numerous quotations from this book throughout this article I have frequently abbreviated the title to D. A.

[2] Reference will be found herein only to Major Barttelot's Diary. Mr. Jameson's Diary has not yet been seen by me, or published, although I hear, on very good authority, it throughout corroborates Major Barttelot's work.—H. Q.

vour to make plain. I have no wish to add a word of accusation to that which appears in this Diary and is contained in the simple record of the facts themselves, though I think, as I wrote more than a year ago, that Mr. Stanley's treatment of his subordinates was systematically ungenerous and unfair. There is abundant intrinsic evidence in 'Darkest Africa' to show that the rear column was practically and unnecessarily abandoned by Mr. Stanley during a whole year, and that the loss of life with that column was, at all events partially, due to that neglect, and that the account given by Mr. Stanley of the conduct of the commanders of that column, especially as regards Major Barttelot, is a piece of special pleading, in many cases self-contradictory, and intentionally conveying a false impression of the facts related.

First of all, let us take the precise accusation made by Mr. Stanley against the conduct of the rear column; and, fortunately, we are able to give this in the succinct words of Mr. Stanley himself, as spoken to a *Times* interviewer, and reported in the *Times* of October 31. 'I wrote that the rear column was wrecked by the irresolution of the officers, and by the non-fulfilment of their promises, and their indifference to the interests of the expedition. I cannot now modify that censure.' This general censure was cast by Mr. Stanley on the rear column in a letter to the 'Emin Pasha Relief Committee' in August, 1888. After more than two years Mr. Stanley repeats it unmodified, as his last utterance on the subject before leaving Ireland for America.[1] No word of regret accompanied the censure then, or accompanies it now; it is plain unsparing, precise in its indictment. It can also be shown to be unmerited. Let us take the counts of accusation in detail. They are three in number. 1. The irresolution of the officers. 2. The non-fulfilment of their promises. 3. Their indifference to the interests of the expedition.

As to 1. Before we can charge any man with irresolution in any given line of conduct, we must show, or at all events assert, that his action was influenced by his hesitation—in matters wherein a choice was left to him. In other words, if a subordinate is left with certain instructions which cause him to act (I here use cause in the sense of force) in a manner which would be irresolute if adopted on his own responsibility, the blame of that irresolution does not belong to him, but

[1] It may be remarked that since writing this portion of my article, events have so rapidly developed, that prominence has been given to Mr. Stanley's later charges; but nevertheless this original indictment remains as the only ground which could justify his action, and as such demands detailed disproof. The refutation of the later charges will be found at the end of this article.—H. Q.

to his commanding officer. He is not indeed irresolute at all, rightly understood, but simply faithful to his instructions. Now it is easy to show that Major Barttelot, unless he disregarded the instructions left for him by Mr. H. M. Stanley (and it must be remembered that before entering upon the expedition he had solemnly contracted to obey those instructions), could have reasonably acted in no other manner than he did. He was instructed (1) that the loss of the goods intrusted to him would be certain ruin to the expedition. (2) He was instructed only to move forward in case of an insufficiency of carriers, by marches of six miles twice over; as shown in Major Barttelot's Diary, this would not have sufficed to carry the loads intrusted to him, and is recognized by Mr. Stanley himself, for, on page 518, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa,' he suggests that in the event of the non-arrival of the carriers, marches of six miles at a time four times over should be made. In other words, that 42 miles should be travelled for every six advanced. At this rate it would have taken Major Barttelot's column over a year and a half of continuous marching, without any allowance for accidents, halts, attacks by the natives, &c., or hindrances in the forest and on the river, to arrive at the Albert Nyanza. Remember that this gigantic, and in fact impossible, enterprise is not contained in Mr. Stanley's letter of instructions (p. 134, Barttelot's Diaries), but simply appears on a pencilled memorandum[1] which he states was made in the presence of Major Barttelot,—and that the letter of instructions only suggests Major Barttelot's advance 'if you (Barttelot) prefer marching to staying for our arrival.' Mr. Stanley's letter of instructions to Major Barttelot is to the effect that the safety and retention of the loads was to be Major Barttelot's first consideration, and that the question of his staying at, or moving forward from, Yambuya was an indifferent one to Mr. Stanley, who was to return to Major Barttelot after spending a fortnight with Emin Pasha. ('We may assume that we shall not be longer than a fortnight with him (Emin Pasha) before deciding on our return to this camp, along the same route traversed by us when going east.' Same authority.) It is clear therefore that, as Major Barttelot did not receive from Tippu Tib,[2] according to the contract made with him by Mr. Stanley, any carriers before June 4th, 1888, it was literally impossible for him, if he followed Mr. Stanley's instructions, to have started earlier; and so far from his having shown irresolution in his desire to start

[1] It is curious that a copy of this memorandum is now in Mr. Stanley's hands, Mr. Bonny retaining the original: how it came into Mr. Bonny's hands is not explained, p. 518, vol. i. D. A.

[2] I adopt Mr. Stanley's spelling throughout.—H. Q.

forward, every page of his Diary, from the date of Mr. Stanley's departure to that on which (June 4th) he writes to Mr. William Mackinnon to say that Tippu Tib has 'at last, but with great reluctance, given us 400 men,' is a record of innumerable attempts made by Major Barttelot and Mr. Jameson to get these carriers, and an expression day after day of his utter misery and disgust at being forced to remain in the Yambuya camp. Remember that Mr. Stanley made this contract; remember that he gave the instructions I have quoted referring to the absolute necessity of these loads to the safety of the expedition; remember that there is no word in his instructions which would justify Major Barttelot in moving forward without these loads; remember the innumerable attempts made by Major Barttelot to force Tippu Tib into the fulfilment of his contract; remember that during this period Major Barttelot travelled in these ineffectual attempts nearly 1200 miles; remember that Mr. Stanley had promised to return to the camp in four or five months; and then say how it could be possible for the commander of the expedition to speak of the irresolution of the dead officer who had so entirely and faithfully obeyed his instructions.

It may perhaps be thought that the irresolution charged in this first count does not refer to Major Barttelot's remaining at Yambuya; but this is not the case. No other cause has been given by Mr. Stanley or even hinted at; and the plain facts with regard to this point are, (1), that from the whole mass of his followers Mr. Stanley picked 389 of the best and strongest; that he left at Yambuya 129 of the worst, a considerable proportion of whom were invalids; that he made a contract with Tippu Tib which that leader evaded altogether for a year, and then only half fulfilled; and that he promised to return to the Yambuya camp in October or November, and did not do so till the following August. (He said to me, 'Good-bye, Major; shall find you here in October when I return.' Letter to Major Sclater, Barttelot's Diaries, p. 46.) We cannot help asking ourselves the question whether, if the provisions and stores, including, be it remembered, far the greater proportion of the ammunition, were so necessary to the safety of the expedition, why they should be left in a camp with which the advance column did not even attempt to preserve communication, guarded only by a few of the refuse of Mr. Stanley's followers and the forty Soudanese?[1] We ask ourselves, too, why, seeing the all-importance of Tippu Tib's fulfilment of his contract to supply the 600 bearers required for these stores, Mr. Stanley

[1] The men had been twice picked over by Mr. Stanley, according to his own words, and none left but the *goe-goees*, or laggers, the sick and the worthless, or, as Lieutenant Troup graphically describes them, 'the scum.'—H. Q.

should not have taken means to insure the fulfilment of that contract before leaving the camp at Yambuya. Mark that the character of Tippu Tib was thoroughly known to, and distrusted by, Mr. Stanley ; mark that he has already, on the way up to Yambuya, had a quarrel with Tippu Tib (see pp. 106 and 108, Major Barttelot's Diaries), to whom he had promised a supply of ammunition which he had not given, and then say whether it is not inexcusably reckless of his officer's life and the safety of his stores, to depart into the forest, leaving the great slave-dealer to fulfil or not his contracts as he likes. Throughout 'Darkest Africa' Mr. Stanley claims, certainly in every chapter, almost on every page, our praises for the precautions he takes, and the success which attends his efforts invariably, even in the smallest details. How is it that he can go so far to meet failure as to leave all that which is essential to the success and safety of his expedition in the charge of a few sick and worthless men, and dependent on the good faith of an Arab slave dealer in whom he has no belief, and who has already cause to be dissatisfied with him ; and having done this and found that the probable consequences of such action have taken place, and that the one honest and capable man whom he left in command has, after eating his heart out in inaction for a year, been killed in his service, how dare he turn round and heap upon the misfortune he has created the odium of his blame and his injustice ?

So much in disproof of the first count in Mr. Stanley's charge against his officers. I have dwelt thus long upon this charge of irresolution, as its disproof practically includes that of Mr. Stanley's second charge : that the officers in question disobeyed his orders. It may be noted here that one great difficulty of making the facts relating to this matter clearly known to the public, and of proving Mr. Stanley's statements with regard to them to be misleading and inaccurate, is that Mr. Stanley frequently contradicts his own words, and in different portions of his book gives different accounts of what really happened, and of his own intentions. I shall give instances of these contradictions in the second portion of this article, when I come to deal with the question of Mr. Stanley's personal conduct towards his subordinates ; but it is useful to remark here *à propos* of this charge of disobedience to orders, that on page 487, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa,' Mr. Stanley denies that these celebrated instructions were 'orders,'[1] and says that they 'are suggestions or advices.' There is abundant proof throughout Major Barttelot's Diaries that this was not the impression

[1] Moreover, Mr. S anley in his censure of the rear column contradicts himself in the above respect, demanding why his orders were not followed, p. 6, vol. i., D. A.—H. Q.

received by him, and on pages 132 and 133 of that book may be read in Major Barttelot's letter of August 15th, 1887, to Mr. William Mackinnon, the detailed account of how, since the 20th June,[1] Major Barttelot and Mr. Jameson had been engaged in carrying out the instructions left by Mr. Stanley in detail. I have compared this letter and the work which it recounts carefully with Mr. Stanley's letter of instructions, and I can find no point in which those instructions have not been attended to. In the fifty-two days which had elapsed between Mr. Stanley's departure from the camp and the writing of this letter by Major Barttelot, that officer had fortified the camp in the prescribed manner, had 'ascertained the position of all villages within a four-mile radius on the southern, eastern, and western sides,' had instituted friendly relations with the natives, as recommended by Mr. Stanley; had also established a complete system of discipline for the administration of the camp, both for officers and men. This letter also contains the proof of the interpretation put by Major Barttelot upon Stanley's instructions with regard to the forward movement of the rear column; and as this is a most important point, I quote the entire passage which includes it:—'Up to the time of writing this, Tippu Tib's men have not arrived, though these marauding Arabs before mentioned may be them. Should it turn out to be so, or should they eventually come, I should march at once in Mr. Stanley's track. If, however, they do not, I shall be compelled to stay here till November, when Mr. Stanley expects to return, or till such time afterwards as he may return.' This letter, be it remembered, has long been public property, as, after it had reached Mr. William Mackinnon, it was published in the *Times* of November 28th, 1887; its contents, therefore, are as well known to Mr. Stanley as to myself. And yet in face of such knowledge, with all the facts of this detailed compliance with his 'instructions,' 'orders,' 'advices,' 'suggestions,' or whatever he may variously call them, he can deliberately sit down and pen the following words:—'I cannot understand why the five officers (Barttelot, Jameson, Ward, Troup, and Bonny) having means for moving, confessedly burning with the desire to move, and animated with the highest feelings, did not move along our track as directed.'—P. 6, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa.' And again, in a letter to Mr. Troup, dated, 'Villa Victoria, Cairo, April 5th, 1890. Why, having received instructions to follow on our track on arrival of the Bolobo contingent, and concentration of the Rear Column at Yambuya, you preferred to rest inactive at Yambuya for eleven months.' Is not the answer perfectly

[1] This is a clerical error: the date of Mr. Stanley's departure is given both in 'Darkest Africa' and in later entries in Barttelot's Diaries as June 28th.—H. Q.

clear? The instructions to move forward were given only in view of certain eventualities which had not happened, and for the non-occurrence of which, if any man is to be held responsible, it must be Mr. Stanley himself, since it was the non-performance of the contract made by him with Tippu Tib which caused the rear column to be unable to move *unless the stores were abandoned.*

Evidently there is not a shadow of ground for accusing Major Barttelot of disobeying his instructions. In the first place, his instructions stated plainly he was only to move if he preferred doing so to awaiting Mr. Stanley's return; in the second place, he was distinctly told not to move except in certain cases, which did not occur; and in the third place, it was strongly impressed upon him that his first consideration was to be the safety of the stores, the loss of which Mr. Stanley stated would be ruin to the expedition. As a matter of fact, he was tied hand and foot to Yambuya camp, unless he disobeyed Mr. Stanley's letter of instructions.

What greater proof could possibly be given of the fact of his intense desire to move as soon as he could do so without disobeying his orders, than the perpetual and wearisome journeys undertaken both by him and Mr. Jameson to Stanley Falls, for the purpose of persuading Tippu Tib to keep his contract[1] and supply the bearers without whom it was impossible to forward the stores on which Mr. Stanley sets so much value?

Mr. Stanley makes it a taunt against Messrs. Jameson and Barttelot that in these journeys, which he scornfully calls only 'marking time,' the one travelled 800 and the other 1,200 miles, but every mile of these journeys is in reality a reproach to him, since they were only undertaken to procure the completion of the means of transport for the stores which those officers were set to guard.

I confess the frame of mind is inconceivable to me, and will, I trust and believe, be inconceivable to most of my readers, which can permit the living and successful leader to hurl such a taunt at the dead men, whose lives would in all probability never have been sacrificed had he not broken his promises, and failed to take any precaution for the safety of his followers. But it is the old story. There are no people who are so rancorous as those who have injured others, and none so unjust as those

[1] It is curious that, though the contract which made Tippu Tib Governor of Stanley Falls has been published *in extenso*, the contract for the supply of carriers for the Expedition is only generally described, and, to the best of my belief, has not been published at all.—H. Q.

who seek to excuse themselves by proving others to be in fault. The apparent truth of the case can be stated in very few words. The safety of Mr. Stanley's rear column was not a matter of great concern to him, or he would have taken precautions, first, to provide for the completion of his contract with a man whom he knew by old experience to be both treacherous and unscrupulous; secondly, to have maintained communications with it during his own forward movements; thirdly, to have provisioned it adequately, and lastly he would not have broken his promise to return to that camp where he had located his stores, and left its officers in entire ignorance of his whereabouts for more than a year.

I have now shown, I think, conclusively, that there is no ground whatever for the first and second charges made by Mr. Stanley against Messrs. Barttelot and Jameson, and I will now deal very briefly with the third charge, which is a general one, and therefore would be, under ordinary circumstances more difficult to dispose of—the charge of indifference to the interests of the expedition shown by the officers in question.[1] We must presume that Mr. Stanley only dates this indifference from the time when he left the camp at Yambuya, for I suppose even he would not count it as a sign of indifference to subscribe £1,000 and undertake the most arduous duties for nothing, as did Mr. Jameson, or the feeling which Major Barttelot showed, when he also, for nothing, placed himself in a wholly subordinate position, under Mr. Stanley's orders, for the sake of being associated with him in the expedition in question. With the point of the fairness of Mr. Stanley's contract with his subordinate officers we shall deal later. For the present it is sufficient to say that by signing it they placed themselves entirely in Mr. Stanley's power, without fee or reward.[2]

Up to the date of his departure from Yambuya, Mr. Stanley has apparently no word of blame for the manner in which Major Barttelot performed his duty,[3] though, as I shall have occasion to explain later, Major Barttelot's Diary reveals much dissatisfaction with Stanley's own behaviour. How, then, are we to interpret the neglect of the interests of the expedition upon which Mr. Stanley insists? We have shown that this neglect could not be attributed to Major Barttelot for remaining

[1] In reference to this point, see the quotation at the beginning of this article.—H. Q.

[2] With the exception of Messrs. Troup and Bonny, who received a salary from Mr. Stanley. —H. Q.

[3] Two exceptions must be made to this, Mr. Stanley having expressed dissatisfaction with Major Barttelot for being two days late on an expedition which he was sent on to Stanley Falls to convey Tippu Tib. Major Barttelot's Diaries show that this delay was not owing to his fault, pp. 103–110.—H. Q.

at Yambuya, since, had he not done so, he would have been not forwarding the aim of the expedition, but risking the very essentials of its success. Can the neglect, then, be said to have been shown in the precautions taken by Major Barttelot for the fortification of his camp and the safety of his followers? This can hardly be the case, since for more than a year, with a garrison only of the sick, incapable, and useless men whom Mr. Stanley had weeded out from the advance column, Major Barttelot maintained his position intact in the midst of a horde of enemies (see page 174 *et seq.* Barttelot's Diaries). Nor is it easily to be found in the innumerable efforts made by him and Mr. Jameson to procure the means of advance.

Let us pass over these long months of expectation and hope deferred and vain watching for the coming of that leader of whom no tidings were heard, and speak of the time when at last Tippu Tib had been persuaded, cajoled, and threatened into sending not 600, but 400 carriers, and see whether the neglect is to be found in such entries as those which I quote from Major Barttelot's Diaries and Letters. I purposely make these extracts as short as possible in order that they may cover the whole time during which Major Barttelot commanded at Yambuya, *i.e.* from Mr. Stanley's departure to shortly before his own death.

### EXTRACTS FROM MAJOR BARTTELOT'S DIARIES.

September 27th, p. 157. 'Report from natives of Stanley's coming back.' 29th. 'No confirmation of the report about Stanley; if I hear nothing fresh I shall start for the Falls Saturday or Sunday.' 'October 4th, p. 158. 'Jameson, two Soudanese and self started at 2.30 a.m. and arrived at Abdullah's camp at 8.30 a.m., Jameson and I walked about twenty-five miles to-day.' October 14th, p. 164, 'No sign of Tippu Tib up to date. I have done all I can now till Stanley puts in appearance, and failing that, I shall not take any decided steps till February. It will be weary waiting but must be gone through with.' December 24th, p. 171. 'A year since I first met Stanley.' Christmas Day, p. 172. 'Gave all hands two metako and twelve cowries; the headmen three metako and eighteen cowries and a whole holiday.' December 31st, p. 173. 'A dull monotonous year for me, and a disappointment for me.' March 14th, 1888. p. 204. 'Caravan arrived with a tremendous lot of men for us, about 2,000 I was told. I sent to find out, when it appeared there were only fifty, and that Tippu Tib will not come till he has sent all our men. I am appalled and determined to send a telegram to Mackinnon. No news of Stanley.' March 17th, pp. 205—207. Long letter of instructions

to Mr. Jameson to proceed to Kasongo for the purpose of interviewing Tippu Tib, and instructing him to get '400 fighting men—300, 200, or even 100 would be better than none.' Then follow details of contract, and the letter concludes with 'All this of course will be void should we hear news of Stanley's certain return. Till such news is heard and made good, or until we meet with Stanley, I am the head of the expedition, and in event of the second case, Mr. Stanley will assume command; but the guarantee shall still stand good up to such date as the men may be used. Money to be paid on arrival at Zanzibar. If your stay at Kasongo be a lengthy one, send a messenger to me with news. Purchase twelve bags of rice, coffee, and ghee for the expedition. Write to Mackinnon fully concerning the agreement.' 'March 27th, 1888, p. 213. Instructions to Ward in detail. To proceed to nearest cable station in order to wire to Mackinnon; the following is part of the message: 'No news of Stanley since writing in October; have sent Jameson to Kasongo to hasten T. T.and obtain from him as many fighting men as possible up to 400, he and I guaranteeing money in name of expedition. Jameson will return about May 14th; if men come before his arrival, start without him—wire advice and opinion.' 'April 4th, p. 223. Consulted with Bonny, who was alone with me in camp, and we both thought I had better go to the Falls and explain our position to Tippu Tib's representative there.' May 22nd, p. 238 (Jameson returns). 'Jameson told me that Tippu Tib hated Stanley because he had broken his word to him about presents he had promised him when he crossed Africa which he had never sent; also because the powder was not at Yambuya in the first instance, and because he said that in June last (1887), acting under Mr. Stanley's orders, I had refused aid to him by not allowing my men to fire on the natives after the burning of the village of Mbunga. He absolved me from all blame, but he had said that if he had not been hurried up by Holmwood, the consul at Zanzibar, and by the fear of losing his good name with the English, he would never have sent the men at all. My firm belief is that he (Tippu) knows about Stanley, and I suspect he is acting a double part.' June 7th, p. 245. 'I have had to write to father about paying the half of the £1000 to Muni Somai (this was the sum to be paid to Tippu Tib for the 400 bearers, the result of Mr. Jameson's negotiations with him, and the amount was guaranteed by Messrs. Jameson and Barttelot), because if the Committee think it too much, they may refuse, and I don't want to be like Stanley when he crossed Africa. I am afraid father will think it a blister if he has to pay, but it cannot be helped. Englishmen's names must not be disgraced for a paltry £500.' June 4th, pp. 270—282. Long letter

to Mr. W. Mackinnon, detailing the agreements made for the carriers, the route intended to be taken by Barttelot, what will be done with the stores not taken, &c.

It may be noted that this letter contains a valuable testimony to the services to the expedition rendered by Mr. Jameson. June 1st, page 296 *et seq.* Extracts from a letter to Sir Walter Barttelot: 'That for the last three months we have been virtually prisoners is, I should think, by now a well-known fact. Every inducement has been offered, every means tried by the Arabs to break the peace; but I have been able to ward it off. Whether Tippu is really in earnest now, and our start a consummated fact, I cannot say. The men are here, the agreement signed, but the fact remains that we are in their hands, with whom no contracts or oaths are binding, and who, if it suits their purpose, will scatter us to the winds. *Stanley, if he gets home, will no doubt twist events so as to make it appear that all the failure was due to me; but if I come back too, I can show him up in his true light, for I have not been round these villages and all the Arab stations hereabouts for nothing.*'[1] (In the same letter follows his request to his father to pay the £500 above alluded to, should it be necessary.) 'And it should be paid to my detriment hereafter, for it is a large sum, and I know how bothered you are about rents:' and then in a P.S. 'Stanley is not dead, to the best of my belief. I can hear nothing about that. That he may be in a fix I think possible, but we will (D.V.) get him out. We leave to-morrow, June 11th. Good-bye to you both, and God bless you!' (Note that this letter, though commenced on June 1st, was not finished till June 10th. It was the last letter written to his family by Major Barttelot (with the exception of a short letter from Stanley Falls).

These numerous extracts from Major Barttelot's Diary and his private letters—extracts which were, it is very evident, never intended to see the light save by his family, and the persons to whom the letters were addressed—form, I think, the most convincing testimony which could be desired in favour of Major Barttelot's care for the interests of the expedition. They show him continually struggling to force the treacherous slave-dealer to furnish him with the means of transport; they show him taking all possible precautions for the safety of the men and stores entrusted to him; they show him sparing no fatigue or effort in his chief's service; they show him and his friend, Mr. Jameson, pledging their private means to obtain the carriers which Mr. Stanley had promised them, and had through his agent failed to supply; and they show

[1] The italics are mine.—H. Q.

him when even a portion of those carriers are obtained, setting forward resolutely on the search for his missing leader, who has left him for thirteen months alone and uninformed even of his safcty. They show also that in all the steps he takes, he is thoughtful of the pecuniary position of the expedition, and safeguards it with a care which is only equalled by his scrupulous determination that whatever engagements he enters into with the natives should be punctiliously carried out.

But I have had another reason for quoting so fully from this Diary, and from thcse letters, and that is, not to prove only Major Barttelot's performance of his duty, but to show something of his true character, of the unconscious self-revelation of the daring English gentleman, the affectionate son, the soldier, and the man of honour. There is a breath of fresh air in thcse words of his, and a strength of right-mindedness and fair dealing which are impossible to gainsay. The language is abrupt, homely, almost schoolboy-likc; there is no hint of self-laudation or self-excuse. Placed in an almost impossible position, this man is evidently trying, simply and honestly, to fulfil the duty set before him, and though he is, as he would say himself, bcastly uncomfortable, and though he recognizes that the circumstances will probably prevent his efforts from being successful, and though he feels that he has been unfairly treated, and deceived in the place assigned to him in the expedition, and in being left alone for more than a year when his chief had promised to return in less than four months, scarcely a word of repining or even of offence crosses his lips, even in his most private communications; and in the last lines of his last letter all he says about Mr. Stanley, is that 'probably he's in a fix, but wc'll get him out of it if we can.'

There is a story told somcwhere by Lawrence of an old Burgundian marauder, who, wounded to death in the heat of the fight, was propped up by his rctaincrs against a tree to die, and when they rcturncd some time after, was heard to murmur as he gazed upon the life-blood, welling slowly from his wounds, 'Le bon vieux sang de Bourgoyne, qu'il coule rouge et fort'; and so with a smile of satisfaction he died. Lawrence tells the story *à propos* of the doctrine of *noblesse oblige*, and winds up his anecdote with the remark that 'In patient, uncomplaining endurance, in the power of rcpressing and obliterating outward tokens of suffering,' the 'good old houses hold their own amongst us still,'[1] and somehow these last months of Major Barttelot's life, and the temper in which he met want, disappointment and misfortune, bring the old story vividly before me. That he was

[1] I quote from memory.—H. Q.

unfairly tried, carelessly neglected, and has been since his death most cruelly and unjustly abused, it is, I think, impossible to doubt; and that the man who was responsible for all these things, and who could never find one word of genuine pity or sincere sympathy for his young comrade's death, should not be blamed for his lack of generosity and consideration, appears to me perfectly incredible. It was only necessary for Mr. Stanley to have written half-a-dozen sentences inspired by the most ordinary sentiments of sympathy and pity, to have shown some faintest consideration for the feelings of Major Barttelot's living relatives and friends, and the fair record of Major Barttelot himself, to have in great measure atoned for the fatal mischance brought about by his own conduct. But instead of this, not a single word of regret or kindness has passed his lips, from the moment when he first heard the news, till the present hour; and his first action was to visit with his severest censure, frequently expressed in words equally harsh and scornful, the conduct of the young man so foully murdered in his service, and this very April he wrote to Major Barttelot's mourning father a long list of charges against his dead son. Those who care to read this effusion will find it on pages 363 to 384 of Major Barttelot's Diaries and Letters. They will find also therein a detailed answer to each charge, given by Major Walter Barttelot, the editor of the Diaries.

In the course of a magazine article it is absolutely impossible to enter into the numberless details with which the present subject is encompassed, and I must here leave without mention many points with which I should have liked to deal at length. Such, for instance, as Mr. Stanley's later and more horrible insinuations against Major Barttelot's character[1] made in various letters to the papers and interviews with the reporters, especially that interview with the reporter of the *New York Herald*, which has been so widely discussed, in which Mr. Stanley asserted—I quote from the *New York Herald* of November 2nd—'That any English jury would have acquitted Barttelot's murderer.' This assertion was understood at the time, and, taken with the context, it would have been difficult to attribute to it any other meaning, to imply that Major Barttelot was shot by a man whom he had dishonoured through his wife. It is true that in a subsequent interview with a correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* Mr. Stanley denied that this was his meaning, but he gave no other explanation of his words, and since then we have had the testimony of the president of the court-martial,

[1] Since writing the above, Mr. Stanley has defined his charges, and I have noticed them in the concluding portion of this article.—H. Q.

who tried and condemned the murderer, which was given to the *Herald's* Brussels correspondent, and published Sunday, November 2nd, to the following effect[1]:—

Mr. Stanley's statement that any English jury would have acquitted Sanga seems to be an impeachment of the court-martial's fairness. The real fact is that during the trial Sanga himself alleged no other motive for murdering Major Barttelot than that Major Barttelot, disturbed during the night of July 17 by Manyuema music revels, which he had strictly forbidden, issued from his hut wherein Mr. Bonny also slept, and discovered that the noise was made by Sanga's wife, and raised his stick against her, whereupon Sanga, in unpremeditated anger, thrust his gun against Major Barttelot's breast and fired. He was so close that Major Barttelot's clothes were found burned on his body. This was the version of all the eye-witnesses, corroborated by Sanga himself. The savage needed no stronger motive than the aforesaid slight provocation to murder Major Barttelot, because he expected that, according to Manyuema customs, he would not be sentenced to more than a pecuniary penalty for taking another man's life. This impression was so much ingrained in Sanga's mind that when he learned he was really going to be shot he shrieked and swooned. Mr. Stanley's insinuations that Sanga was impelled by greater and fouler provocations may rest upon secret reports which he probably believes true, but which are shown to be false by Sanga's own confession.

It is of course evident that even had Mr. Stanley's assertion been fully accurate, instead of entirely the reverse, it would have been no answer to the real question at issue, and could only have been considered as a wanton blackening of his subordinate's character.[2]

Another point on which Mr. Stanley has written most vehemently, and about which indeed he appears to feel more concerned than anything else, is what he describes as the officers (*i.e.* the rear-column commander and subordinates) reducing their 'chief to a state of destitution'; and again in a letter to Mr. Troup, dated 5th April, 1890, as rendering your 'chief naked'; and again in another letter to the same gentleman, as, 'stripping me naked, or remaining silent while I was being reduced to poverty.'[3]

It will scarcely be credited that Mr. Stanley's only ground for these extraordinarily picturesque assertions, is the fact that when Major Barttelot was at last able to move forward, and had necessarily to

[1] My readers will, I trust, pardon the slight repetition which occurs here, as it was necessary to some extent to recapitulate this point in the later portion of the article.—H. Q.

[2] It will be noticed by careful readers of the statement made by Mr. Bonny with regard to this assassination of Major Barttelot that his account is materially different from that of Mr. Stanley, although the latter derives his information from Mr. Bonny himself. It is also different, and almost inconsistent with the account which Mr. Bonny wrote in his official report of this occurrence almost immediately after it took place, which is quoted on p. 490, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa.'—H. Q.

[3] See 'With Stanley's Rear Column,' pp. 289, 292.—H. Q.

discard 137 of the loads left with him, owing to the comparatively few carriers he was able to obtain, he made a selection from Mr. Stanley's personal luggage, sending forward only such things as he thought would be required, and ordering the rest to be sent to Bangala for safety. This selection from Mr. Stanley's personal luggage was made by Major Barttelot, Mr. Jameson, and Mr. Werner, and is fully described on page 247 of Major Barttelot's Diaries. The sole object was the separation of what was not immediately wanted, from what would be required, and the opening of all the boxes was necessitated in order to make the division. It is curious, and seems almost prophetic, to find Major Barttelot writing in a letter of this date to Miss ——, that 'To-day we had to open Mr. Stanley's boxes.—I expect he will make a stir about our opening his boxes ; he is so suspicious of anything of that kind ; but as some of them are more like Noah's arks than boxes, I cannot carry them ; and they must be opened to get out anything we may think he wants!' All this evidence was before Mr. Stanley when he made the above charges, and it is difficult to understand how, since such was the case, he could have possibly believed in their truth. This is the case with several minor points in which the action of the rear-guard is censured by Mr. Stanley, *e.g.*, of that in which he says that, although he had left three hundred thousand percussion caps, yet it was necessary, for some reason he cannot divine, to purchase £48 worth more, the reason of this being the caps he had purchased were so bad as to be useless, and this must have been known to Mr. Stanley, since his attention was called to the fact by Mr. Jameson himself on the voyage up to Yambuya camp.

I have now shown, conclusively, how much truth there is in the assertion made by Mr. Stanley that the rear column was wrecked by the irresolution of its officers, their disobedience to orders, and their neglect of the interests of the expedition. I have shown Major Barttelot, their leader, to have been resolute and consistent in action, to have been strictly obedient to the instructions left with him by Mr. Stanley, and to have forwarded the interests of the expedition, not only by the utmost efforts to guard the stores committed to him, and obtain the help that was necessary for carrying those stores forward, but even by pledging his personal credit and that of Mr. Jameson to obtain the assistance required.

I now come to the consideration of Mr. Stanley's own conduct on this expedition, and shall endeavour to show whether it was of such a character as readers of 'Darkest Africa' are led to believe, and as the praise which he has demanded for himself, and which has so liberally

been granted him, would seem to imply. This conduct of Mr. Stanley's is a very complicated question, and can of course be only very cursorily and imperfectly described in the few pages at our disposal. It would take a couple of volumes as large as his own to point out all the inaccuracies and mis-statements which are to be found in 'Darkest Africa;' and to prove what were the real aims of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition would be an affair of extreme difficulty and tedium, and would probably involve in the course of the narrative the liability of many others than Mr. Stanley himself.

The secret history, in fact, of this expedition, and its probable connection with the Imperial British East Africa Company, has not been, and cannot yet be, written. We know that there is a history, and here and there we discern traces of its character, but that is all.

I divide Mr. Stanley's conduct into three distinct portions: 1, His action in connection with the English public, the Emin Pasha Relief Fund, and the expedition in general; 2, his conduct towards the officers who accompanied him; 3, his conduct towards Emin Pasha himself.[1] 'The one chief point,' said a great novelist to me once, 'if you want to tell a story, is to make certain that you begin at the beginning'—and the beginning in the present instance is the character of Mr. Stanley himself, for it must be remembered that this last expedition is but one of a series, and was not undertaken by a man without a history. Mr. Stanley is not only an explorer, with a sword in his hand and a Bible in his jack-boot, as we are sometimes inclined to fancy in reading his highly-spiced narratives, he is an ambitious, wary, and long-headed man of the world; a keen weapon in the hands of a king desirous of territory, or a commercial company eager for wealth. His relations with Leopold of Belgium, though they are shrouded in mystery in their extent and character, are certainly intimate and extremely important, and we have long since seen some fruits of these in the acquisition of the Congo Free State. When therefore we find that many of those gentlemen who formed the Emin Pasha Relief Committee in London and contributed largely to the Relief Fund, happen also to be the same as are to be found on the direction of the Imperial British East Africa Company, and when we read (page 68, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa') that the first thing Mr. Stanley did on his arrival at Zanzibar was to obtain a concession from the Sultan which Mr. Mackinnon, of the Emin Pasha Expedition and Imperial British East Africa Company, had fruitlessly tried to obtain long ago,

[1] The third division forms a complete story in itself, and is not dealt with in the present article.—H. Q.

and that that concession embraced a coast line of over 400 miles (p. 57, Barttelot's Diaries) and the towns of Mombasa and Melindi, we are tempted to ask, first, whether there was not some understanding between Mr. Mackinnon[1] and Mr. Stanley; secondly, whether it was from pure philanthropy that Mr. Stanley arranged this little matter; and thirdly, whether it was quite the right use to which to put the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition? Could it have been in that gratitude which has been defined as a recognition of favours to come, that Sir Wm. Mackinnon and Peter Mackinnon, Esq., subscribed between them £4,500 to the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition (p. 461, vol. ii., 'Darkest Africa'); and is it not almost touching to find that in Mr. Henry Stanley's long dedicatory letter to Sir Wm. Mackinnon of the story of this expedition, he has the modesty to doubt whether Sir William is sufficiently convinced of the 'reality of my friendship and devotion to you (Sir W. M) and to my friends of the Emin Relief Committee,' and assures him that if he is satisfied that Mr. Stanley has 'faithfully and loyally accomplished the missions' entrusted to him, he, Mr. Stanley, requires no higher praise; to which we can only suggest that if the gentlemen in question were not satisfied with the little present of territory made to them by Mr. Stanley's influence, and of course made gratuitously out of the fulness of Mr. Stanley's heart—'quite keerless-like,' as Mark Twain would say—they must be singularly hard to please.

In connection with this point, an assertion which has been frequently made, both with authority and anonymously is worth noting. I take the latest expression of it from an interview with Mr. Rose Troup, quoted in the *New York Herald* of November 2nd. Mr. Troup, it will be remembered, also served with Mr. Stanley on a former expedition, and was highly praised by him as being one of those 'who have been conspicuous for their capacity and their all-round fitness for special fields of labour;' and again, as being, in Mr. Stanley's belief, a 'thoroughly good officer.' Hear then what this thoroughly capable man and good officer has to say:—

> Mr. Stanley is a great explorer, but he went into this Emin Relief Expedition for fame and what he could get out of it. He has no more philanthropy than my boot. I will go further, and say that the expedition was in the nature of a speculation, and not a philanthropic relief movement. The capitalists backing it were after the ivory which Emin Pasha was supposed to have collected. The officers of the expedition were promised certain shares in the expected big supply of ivory as a reward for their services. The release of Emin Pasha was a secondary consideration entirely.

Now I beg all my readers to note most carefully that I quote the above in no way as an argument, or attributing any belief whatever to

[1] Now Sir William Mackinnon.—H. Q.

Mr. Troup's *bonâ fides*, or attaching any value to his opinion. I know very little indeed about Mr. Troup, and am not in the least disposed to rely upon him for evidence, but this statement of his has a certain value as a perfectly plain, straightforward accusation by a member of Mr. Stanley's company, and it merely repeats what has been frequently written and published in the newspapers as to Mr. Stanley's object, and that of the directing powers of the Emin Pasha Relief Committee. I would point out that I have shown a very much greater object than the acquisition of ivory, which that committee, or at all events its most prominent members, did obtain by the expedition; but still I am of course convinced that their sole object was, as was so loudly asserted, the relief of Emin Pasha. Moreover I believe that they were far too business-like and highly educated a body of men to rely upon such a risky speculation as the annexation of a problematical quantity of ivory which was reported to be waiting for somebody to carry away from the heart of Africa. It is pleasant to find, though, that while not relying on any such unsound speculation, the committee nevertheless took precautions that if the ivory existed they should obtain their fair share of it, and that they even pestered the Foreign Office to bring pressure to bear upon the Egyptian Government to prevent that Government claiming an undue proportion. In view of the high-toned and altogether elevating philanthropy of Mr. Stanley's expedition, as described by its leader, these little commercial touches, appropriate to a nation of shopkeepers, are inexpressibly refreshing; they bring us down, as it were from that empyrean in which so few of us can long breathe comfortably, and supply us with an intelligible motive for, and a proper commercial view of actions and their fitting recompense, which before seemed almost too chivalrous to be profitable, and too unselfish to be real. As we are now dealing with commercial people, it is as well to quote the exact words of the Emin Relief Committee. The whole letter is instructive, and I give it entire:—

*Emin Relief Committee to Foreign Office* (received March 26).

28 WYNNSTAY GARDENS, KENSINGTON,
*March* 25, 1887.

SIR,—In the concluding part of your letter of the 16th instant allusion is made to the question of ivory, and the hope expressed by Nubar Pasha that the expenses incurred by the Egyptian Government would be covered by the sale of the ivory they possess at Wadelai.

Referring to a letter from Mr. W. Mackinnon to the late Lord Iddesleigh, dated Nov. 27, 1886, the following paragraph occurs: 'It appears from information in the newspapers that Emin Bey is believed to have considerable quantities

of ivory, which might be utilized for repayments of outlays connected with any scheme of relief. The Committee would naturally expect that, if this anticipation be realized, a just proportion should be made over to them.'

I have now the honour to request that Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs may see fit to have the just claims of the Committee for their proportion of the ivory at Wadelai acknowledged by the Egyptian Government, in order that no misunderstanding may arise in the future, and that the utmost harmony of purpose may exist between the objects of the Committee and that of the Egyptian Government.

I have, etc., (Signed) F. DE WINTON, Hon. Secretary,
Emin Relief Committee.

We are now in a position in which our view of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition loses much of its unreality. We find that it was solidly built, so to speak, upon ivory, and included, incidentally, the acquisition of a fair slice of the Dark Continent; but this is by no means all that there is to be said in its favour. We have yet to recognize the part played by Leopold of Belgium in this charitable scheme, and this may be read in plain words from pages 58 to 60, Major Barttelot's Diaries.

I regret that I have no space to quote these *in extenso:* they include the following facts. An arrangement with Tippu Tib, whereby he was to receive £360 a year from the King of the Belgians and to be made Governor of the Falls Station. He was to do no slave-dealing below the station, according to the conversation reported in vol. i. p. 71, 'Darkest Africa,' but he was to be allowed a free hand above Stanley Falls—in other words, over 'a vast distance of some hundreds of thousands of square miles, and with a large native population' (page 59, Barttelot's 'Diaries'). I find, however, on turning to the actual text of the agreement between Mr. Stanley and Tippu Tib, that even the above does not express accurately all the powers entrusted to the latter. The agreement does, indeed, include preventing the tribes downwards from Stanley Falls engaging in the slave-trade, but no mention is made therein of Tippu Tib himself, and the next clause but one to that above referred to runs as follows:—

> Tippu Tib is to be at full liberty to carry on his *private legitimate trade in any direction*,[1] and to send his caravans to and from any place he may desire (*Clause* 3).

In order to appreciate the full meaning of this contract which Mr. Stanley made on behalf of the King of the Belgians with the great slave-dealer, it is only necessary to turn to Mr. Stanley's own account of what Tippu Tib's trade really implies—the trade, be it remembered,

[1] The italics are mine.—H. Q.

being the trade in slaves and the acquisition of ivory. As to the ivory—

Every tusk, piece and scrap, in the possession of an Arab trader has been steeped and dyed in blood. Every pound weight has cost the life of a man, woman, or child; for every five pounds a hut has been burned; for every two tusks a whole village has been destroyed; every twenty tusks have been obtained at the price of a district with all its people, villages, and plantations (p. 230, Vol. I. 'D. A.').

As to the slaves, the adult aborigines are killed off and the children preserved.

The girls are distributed among the Arab, Swahili, and Manyuema harems, the boys are trained to carry arms and are exercised in the use of them. When they are grown tall and strong enough they are rewarded with wives from the female servants of the harem, and then are admitted partners in these bloody ventures. So many parts of the profits are due to the great proprietor, such as Tippu Tib, etc. (p. 229, vol. i. 'Darkest Africa').

Such is Mr. Stanley's own opinion of the results of the private trade of Tippu Tib, for the regulation of which he, on behalf of the King of the Belgians, concluded the agreement which was the second object achieved by him after landing at Zanzibar in command of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition. And it is worth mentioning that immediately subsequent to the conclusion of this agreement we find given as one of his reasons—'I wish to engage Tippu Tib and his people to assist me in conveying the ammunition to Emin Pasha, and *on return to carry this ivory*.'[1] (The italics are mine.) Not, of course, that Mr. Stanley wished for the ivory for himself or for his friends of the Emin Pasha Relief Committee, but because—

The subscription of Egypt to the Emin Pasha Fund is large for her depressed finance. In this quantity of ivory we had a possible means of recouping her treasury, with a large sum left towards defraying expenses, and perhaps leaving a handsome present for the Zanzibari survivors.

The amount of ivory reported to be in Emin's possession was seventy-five tons, which at the present price of 12*s*. per lb. amounts to about £100,000; so that there certainly would have been a considerable margin left after recouping 'the distressed finance of Egypt' for defraying the expenses of the expedition. I quote the following comment of Major Walter Barttelot's for what it is worth; those who are acquainted with the account of Mr. Stanley's expedition of 1874 will recognize its substantial accuracy:—

It will be remembered that Tippu Tib had benefited by Mr. Stanley's expedition of 1874 by following the explorer's route, and that he had in conse-

[1] P. 59, Barttelot's Diaries.

quence obtained possession of all the country on the Congo east of the Falls Station, the King of the Belgians having benefited to a like extent on the west. Was Mr. Stanley about to help his friends still more? By the agreement he makes Tippu Tib acknowledge the titular sovereignty of the King, and he makes the King acknowledge the right of the slave-dealer to carry on his infamous trade and give him £360 per annum. The King lends Mr. Stanley one steamer on the Congo for the expedition; Tippu Tib, apparently, is not expected to help his friend in any way, for the carriers, if provided, are to be paid for.

It may be asked perhaps by readers who have not cared to follow the facts quoted above carefully, what all this has to do with Mr. Stanley's character and his conduct to the expedition in question? I answer that it was necessary to show that Mr. Stanley was engaged in great concerns with which the professed object of that expedition had little or nothing to do.[1] That he was endeavouring to serve, and was indeed successful in serving, many masters; and that those who were engaged as his subordinates were really helping in enterprises of which they knew nothing, and the achievement of which was a prominent object of their leader. When the King of the Belgians lends Mr. Stanley a steamer on the Congo for the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition, Mr. Stanley utilizes it, it is true; but he also utilizes the steamer which has been placed at his disposition by the British India Steam Company to transport Tippu Tib and ninety of his followers at the cost of the expedition to Stanley Falls.[2] In this round-about fashion it comes to pass that those who subscribed in London to relieve Emin are, though most of them know it not, subscribing to assist in the acquisition of territory by the Imperial British East Africa Company, and to place the greatest slave-dealer in the world in his new governorship on the Congo, in accordance with the wishes of the King of the Belgians.

Let us now see the actual position which was occupied by the officers who accompanied this expedition, and what chance they had of understanding Mr. Stanley's real designs. Be it remembered that some of these officers, with the exception of Surgeon Parke, Mr. Bonny, and Mr. Troup, of whom the two last were paid servants, and the former gave his services free, had contributed large sums of money towards the expedition, amounting between them to some thousands. (I may remark here that the figures in the books of Major Barttelot and Mr. Stanley differ; for instance, the sum given by Major Walter Barttelot as having been furnished by his brother is £1,300, and the same amount is there

[1] It is useful to note in this connection the assertion of the Emin Pasha Relief Committee made in the *Times*, Nov. 10th, 1890, 'that not any motive of personal advantage' whether 'of fame, riches, or ivory,' actuated them 'in the slightest degree'!—H. Q.

[2] From Zanzibar, or, in other words, between three and four thousand miles.—H. Q. See p. 55, Barttelot's Diaries.

attributed to Mr. Jephson, though here also Mr. Stanley mentions £1000 as the subscription made. Probably the odd £300 in each case is the cost of the officers' personal outfit.

First, to what did Mr. Stanley's subordinate officers pledge themselves by the articles of their agreement? And here we come face to face with a very curious fact, namely that the agreement which each signed is, so to speak, an entirely one-sided one. It pledges the signatory to go on the expedition, to accept any post assigned to him by Mr. Stanley, to serve him loyally and devotedly, to follow him by whatsoever route he may choose, and not to publish anything connected with the expedition, or to send any accounts to the newspapers, for six months after the issue of the official publication of the expedition by the leader or his representative. But it pledges Mr. Stanley to nothing at all, save the provision of a revolver, Winchester rifle, ammunition for the same, tent, canteen, a due share of European provisions, and £40 for outfit.[1] In fact, by signing it for no consideration save that of being permitted to accompany Mr. Stanley, the unpaid officers place themselves bound hand and foot in Mr. Stanley's power.

So strongly was this felt, that the doctor who was selected to fill the post of medical officer, and who had already, it is significant to observe, served with Mr. Stanley on the Congo, declined to sign the agreement as it stood, requiring the insertion of the words (with regard to the agreement to publish nothing until six months after Mr. Stanley's official report), 'except in the case of my reputation being attacked.' It is characteristic of Mr. Stanley's extreme ingenuity in presenting his actions in the most favourable light, that in the account of this incident given in 'Darkest Africa' entire omission is made of this objection of Dr. Leslie's, whose name is indeed not even mentioned. It seems as though the course of future events must to a certain extent have been foreseen by Mr. Stanley when he took such precautions to shut the mouths of all those who accompanied him on his expedition till six months after he had given his own version.[2]

Now although the duties of the subordinates are defined in this agreement, and that of the leader omitted, I think we must allow, if we consider this as a contract made by a gentleman with gentlemen

[1] It is perhaps worth noting that in the only case where this outfit is mentioned by one of the subordinate officers, *i.e.* Lieutenant Troup, it is according to his statement *not* supplied.—H. Q. See Preface to 'With Stanley's Rear Column,' by J. Rose Troup.

[2] Surgeon Parke, who was taken in place of Dr. Leslie, was an old comrade and friend of Major Barttelot's, and by him introduced to Mr. Stanley, though this is not mentioned in 'Darkest Africa.'—See Barttelot's Diaries, page 52.

that the latter duty did exist by implication, and somewhat to the following effect:—

I, Henry M. Stanley, Leader of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition, agree to employ (say Major Barttelot) on that expedition in a manner suitable to his rank and reputation. I agree to treat him as a gentleman, and be faithful to him as a comrade, to take all due care for his safety and maintenance in any position which I cause him to occupy, and to give him a fair share of such honour and reward as may be obtained by the expedition in return for his service and loyalty.

(Signed) HENRY M. STANLEY.

After all, it is a sound legal maxim which tells us that there can be no claim enforced for goods for which no 'valuable consideration' has been given; and I do not think that any soldier or any gentleman can be found to deny that a correlative duty, such as that which I have sketched above, existed on the part of Mr. Stanley. Nay, more, in view of what has occurred since Major Barttelot's death, should there not have been one further clause to the effect that—'I agree not to use the right of prior publication which I have reserved to myself to assail the honour or impugn the conduct of those subordinates with whose conduct I may feel dissatisfied without affording them an immediate opportunity of self-vindication; and with regard to those who may have died in my service I hold myself bound to put the most favourable interpretation which the circumstances will possibly allow upon their conduct, and to publish nothing which in any way affects their fair fame until I have before me the full record of all circumstances in which their service was concerned'?

This implied contract with his officers Mr. Stanley has undoubtedly broken. He chose to consider them not as comrades and helpers, and certainly not as officers and gentlemen. He chose to forget that they were as essential to the expedition as himself, and held an equally honourable though less prominent part in it. He chose to assume that he could use or disuse them—praise, blame, or slander them, as he would—without having to account for his conduct. It is curious to see how in Major Barttelot's Diaries from day to day, the character of Stanley gradually develops—strips itself, as it were, of all disguise—and how the frank spirit and unaffected dignity of the young English officer resents the treatment which he received—his feeling affecting in its turn Mr. Stanley's own feeling towards him—towards, probably, the only one of his expedition in whom he discerned a possible rival, or at least sharer, of his reputation. Remember what Major Barttelot's record had been; remember how he had fought at Kandahar, at Tel-el-Kebir, at Abu Klea, and how Wolseley, and Grenfell, and Redvers Buller had thanked him for his services, and rewarded him for

his bravery; and then picture what it must have been to this youngster —for he was only twenty-seven when he joined Stanley—to be raged at as if he were a defaulting mess-sergeant on the slightest provocation, and accused on the word of a Zanzibari carrier of opening the Fortnum and Mason provision boxes:—

> Parke told me that the Zanzibaris had informed Stanley that we, the Europeans, had opened the Fortnum and Mason boxes; so Parke, in answer to Stanley, said, 'Yes, but the only person who had had any of the contents was himself, and that he should advise him to put a little more trust in his officers, who were at any rate gentlemen, and not accustomed to being accused of that sort of thing' (Barttelot's Diaries, page 83);

to which one can only add, 'Bravo, Surgeon Parke!'

At the risk of appearing tedious, I must here give one or two further extracts in order to show how curiously opposed to the picture Mr. Stanley gives of himself, his tender-heartedness and his philanthropy, in 'Darkest Africa,' is his conduct as set down by Major Barttelot in his private diary.

After reading these the reader will be forced to the conclusion that either the events narrated by Major Barttelot did not take place as reported, or that Mr. Stanley as viewed by his officers is a strangely different being to Mr. Stanley as viewed by himself; and it is worth while to remember that these words of Major Barttelot's are not only not written with a view to publication, *but are also capable of verification by others*—a description which can by no means apply to a very large number of Mr. Stanley's own statements in 'Darkest Africa' —especially those relating to Major Barttelot, the most important of which rests entirely on an *ex parte* statements made by himself, unsupported by other testimony, and conflicting to a considerable extent with his own previously written words. I refer here especially to the elaborate and lengthy conversation which he asserts took place with Major Barttelot before Mr. Stanley's departure from Yambuya.

## Extracts from Major Barttelot's Diary.

> April 24th, 1887.—The very first day out the Soudanese grumbled because they had to carry their own kit, but when they found they had to carry rations as well, they refused to go on. However, Stanley talked them over, and they carried their rations for twenty days; but after ten days were up they had eaten or thrown them away.
>
> Stanley refused to give them more: they refused to march. He threatened to shoot them: they said, 'Shoot! we can shoot, too.'

However, he gave in, but sent them on with seventy sick men and myself ahead. I never had such a time in my life—urging, threatening, wearing work. A man's load is sixty-five pounds, and then he has to carry his rations for twelve or thirteen days. One pound of rice a day only.

Certainly human transport presents a very sad aspect of life. The missionaries and station people have been very kind to us on the way up. I feel very well at present, but not always very bright; there are so many sad things happening all round—starvation, sickness, and lingering death, which nothing can avert.

I like all the fellows, but Jameson and Stairs the best; they never complain and are always ready.

April 28.—We left camp at 5.30 a.m.; our road lay through a dense jungle and high grass. I fancy the reason of Stanley sending me on is that he dislikes me on account of the Soudanese, and hates them. Stanley intends leaving me in the rear, I think; at least, he told me so at Leopoldville—a bit of spite.

May 5th—Troup was left behind—a great shame, as Troup had done good work, besides being the first chosen. A few hours later, the *Peace*, with Stanley, and the *Henry Reid*, with Tippu Tib, Bonny, and Walker, arrived. I saw Stanley: he came to a chunbeck, and told me he intended leaving me behind at Bolobo, and that I was eventually to go up to the Falls with Troup and Bonny, who remain with me at Bolobo; I am to proceed to an entrenched camp, which he would already have formed and assume command. Should I have enough porters, and can get guides and men from Tippu Tib, I am to proceed to Wadelai. This sounds very well, but my stay at Bolobo would probably be of four months duration; and unless I obtain a distinct assurance of aid from Tippu Tib, and promise of proceeding to Wadelai, I would go home. His object at present is personal dislike to me and hatred of the Soudanese, and his treatment of Troup is most unfair.

May 15th.—Stanley left in the *Peace* at 6.30 a.m.; the *Henry Reid* followed with Parke and company and Tippu Tib on board. There was some slight difference of opinion between Parke, the captain, and Stanley concerning Tippu Tib's smelling women occupying the only cabin. I believe Stanley settled it in favour of Tippu Tib. He left Ward and Bonny (at Bolobo) with 125 men and enough European provisions for about fourteen days: it is disgraceful, I think; we shall soon all of us be without them; he himself is pretty well off.

June 19th.—I was then to take command of the entrenched camp, and if Tippu Tib had got some carriers ready, those which he promised to have, I was to move on with all the loads and men towards Wadelai; but if I was unable to transport all the loads, I was to await Stanley's return. I dined that night on the s.s. *Stanley*, and got orders to march to the Kwar River and await the return of the *Stanley* from Bolobo. No word of thanks for the wood we had cut or food we had obtained.

Friday, May 20.—The morning of this day was exciting to some of us—at least, for Stairs and Jephson. It seems that early in the morning nearly all the Zanzibaris went from the *Stanley* to see Mr. Stanley, and complained that Stairs and Jephson had thrown over a day's rations, which they had bought and paid

for. The real facts of the case are that at the village which they looted[1] they brought on to the steamer such a fearful lot that the steamer could not carry it, so it had to be thrown away—or some portion of it. The throwing away was superintended by Stairs and Jephson. The Zanzibaris also complained of Jephson's tyranny in striking them, &c. I sent Stairs over to find out about some business, and he found this concourse assembled, and Stanley mad with rage. He raged at Stairs about it, and Stairs told him the facts of the case, and the disgraceful behaviour of the Zanzibaris. Stanley, who was on his steamer, the *Peace*, Stairs being on shore, said that he (Stairs) began it all by going into the village first and commencing the row by shouting for arms, &c. So Stairs told him (Stanley) that about twenty Zanzibaris had gone in first, and had run away from the villagers Stanley would not hear about it, and said that the Soudanese commenced the plunder (which they did not), and that Stairs was the real cause of the disturbance. Parke wrote a note to Jephson to come over, and he went. Stanley attacked Stairs and Jephson in a frantic state, stamping about the deck of the *Peace*. He called Jephson all sorts of names.

Then he turned round to the men, about 150, and spoke Swahili to the effect that the men were to obey them no more; that if they issued any orders to them they were to tie them to trees (referring to Jephson and Stairs); lastly, offering to fight Jephson. He also said to Stairs, before Jephson came up, that a mutiny was brewing, and that if he only raised a finger, the Zanzibaris would rush upon him and crush him, or club him to death.

I was astonished when Stairs and Jephson returned and told me about it, especially in Stairs's case, for no kinder officer to the men, or more zealous or hard-working officer, is there in the expedition, besides being most efficient and capable. The missionaries, two of them, who heard the disturbance, and the captain and the engineer of the *Peace*, never heard such language, or witnessed such a disgraceful scene before. I believe this is Stanley's method of carrying on in Central Africa, but I had judged him pretty well before, and was not surprised so much at his conduct. However, I gave him time to cool down, shaving in the meanwhile, and then went over to see him. We were lying 200 yards up stream. On the way I met Parke, who told me that Stanley had called him on to the *Peace*, and opined that we were talking about him; that it was apparent to him that we had formed a compact against him and were tired of the expedition, and only made a row to get sent back. Parke assured him of our loyalty, and earnest wishes to carry on the work. I then saw Stanley, and told him I was sorry for what had happened, asking to know his wishes concerning Jephson and Stairs, whether they were really dismissed or not. He said they were. Harped back on his old idea of the compact. I assured him to the contrary. He said he could carry on the expedition without any of us.

I asked him whether I was to tell Jephson and Stairs that his decision was irrevocable. He hesitated, and then said, 'As regards myself, it is.' By that alone I knew he was blustering. I went away, and Jephson and Stairs came over, at my advice, and saw him, and squared it. It is a baddish look-out, for,

[1] The men often had no food of a day supplied by Mr. Stanley, so they were obliged to loot villages to get food.

of course, the seeds of mutiny have been sown against us, and may at any moment crop up.—Pp. 95—98, Barttelot's Diary.

Now if we compare these entries with the account given by Mr Stanley in 'Darkest Africa' for the same period, it is a most remarkable fact that there is hardly a single incident recounted therein which appears in Mr. Stanley's narrative. All these exciting scenes with his subordinate officers, which we find set down in detail by Major Barttelot, are one after one omitted, and though the account of the journey from March 18th to May 20th takes twenty-five pages in Major Barttelot's diary, and twenty-seven longer pages (equivalent to about thirty-five in Barttelot's book), in Mr. Stanley's 'Darkest Africa,' he cannot find room therein for one of the conversations reported by Major Barttelot, or one of the more important incidents in that officer's narrative. As far as Stanley's narrative presents the facts, all went merry as a marriage bell, on this halcyon journey. But as the Major tells the story, exactly the reverse is the case, and day after day there appear to have been serious disagreements between Stanley and almost every one of the officers accompanying him. What are we to conclude from this discrepancy? Are the facts set down entirely the product of Major Barttelot's imagination, or are they the facts, which Mr. Stanley of set purpose omits, in order to produce a false impression of the relations subsisting between himself and his comrades? These are very serious questions, for, if Mr. Stanley is capable of intentionally misleading the public with regard to one portion of his journey, he is capable of misleading it with regard to the whole; if it be true that he threatened Major Barttelot as Major Barttelot asserts (page 82), saying it was in his (Stanley's) power to ruin Barttelot in the service; if it be true that he told the Zanzibaris that they were to tie Jephson and Stairs to trees if they issued any orders to them; if he threatened Stairs as asserted (page 97), that 'if he only raised a finger the Zanzibaris would rush upon him (Stairs) and crush him or club him to death'; if he subsequently dismissed Jephson and Stairs, and accused Barttelot of combining with them against him, and only took the two first named back after Barttelot's intercession;—if all these things happened as Major Barttelot explicitly states they did, the most important of them on May 20th, what are we to think of reading as Mr. Stanley's sole entry on that date:—

We halted on the 20th at Lukolela to purchase food for our journey to the Equator Station, and we were extremely grateful for the kind hospitality shown to us by the missionaries at this station.[1]

[1] P. 105, vol. i, 'Darkest Africa.'

What! here are occurrences so grave as to threaten the very existence of the expedition, to cause the intended dismissal of two of its officers, and the accusation of the second in command, and they are not even deemed to require a word of notice. Again, Major Barttelot states that on April 28th Stanley told him he intended to leave him behind, and that again on the 5th May he told him that he was to remain at Bolobo, and eventually proceed to the Falls with Troup and Bonny; whereas Stanley asserts that it was on May 12th that this was settled, and gives a long conversation with Major Barttelot, representing that it was an honour for Major Barttelot to remain, that he asked Barttelot to select his companion, and that the Major chose Jameson, and much more. There is not a single word of this conversation or any allusion to it given in Major Barttelot's Diaries; indeed, he does not appear to have seen Stanley on that day, May 12th, which is grouped with the three preceding ones under a general entry. Is it not strange that if this conversation took place as reported, Major Barttelot, who seems to have recounted every previous time on which he spoke to Mr. Stanley, should have omitted all reference to it whatever, as he omits later all reference to the even more important conversation (occupying ten pages of 'Darkest Africa' [117 to 126]) on June 24th, the same day on which the celebrated letter of instructions is delivered to him? What possible reason could Major Barttelot have had for keeping no record of, and making no allusion to, these elaborate conversations, in which both his leader and himself are reported to have discussed the question of his whole future conduct, and setting down *in extenso* comparatively unimportant ones? I can find no explanation of this, granting that the conversations actually took place, except on the assumption that Major Barttelot deliberately intended to suppress them, but for what object could he have done so? and how are the conversations themselves consistent with the relations which every reference to Mr. Stanley made by Major Barttelot in his diary indicates? They are the conversations apparently of a humble subordinate, and of a noble-minded and affectionate chief; but Major Barttelot was as little humble, as his chief was generous; he was labouring under a distinct sense of injury; he was a young man, burning to distinguish himself, who was being left behind wholly against his will, after, according to his own account, having been threatened with military disgrace, and the destruction of his reputation if he crossed Mr. Stanley's wishes.

I now come to the last point which affects the direct conduct of Mr. Stanley to Major Barttelot while he was alive, and that is the

conversation before alluded to which is printed on pages 117—126, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa,' and is supposed to have taken place at Major Barttelot's request on the same day (June 24) on which Mr. Stanley delivered the latter his letter of instructions. It is remarkable that, as in the case of the conversation of which we have just been speaking, there is no mention whatever in Major Barttelot's Diary of any important conversation or interview with Mr. Stanley on that day, and no subsequent allusion to any such conversation having taken place. There is an entry for June 24th, but it concerns only the burial of an interpreter who had died the previous day, and two or three details as to the fortification of the camp. Yet this conversation occupies ten closely printed pages, is of the utmost importance, and, indeed, renders the letter of instructions in a great measure a secondary matter. Is it conceivable that Major Barttelot should have omitted all mention of a conversation of this kind? One point, though comparatively small in itself, is very significant in relation to the above question. It is this: On page 119, in the course of this conversation, Mr. Stanley reports himself as saying:

> Look at these pencilled calculations on this paper—nay, you can keep it, if you please. They represent what you can do with your own men, and what you can do assuming that Tippu Tib really keeps to the letter of his contract.

What became of this most important memorandum, the only written evidence of what Major Barttelot could do in the event of the carriers not being supplied—in fact, his chief's authority for the action he was to take under certain circumstances? In some curious manner which is not explained, it appears to have passed into the hands of Mr. Bonny, who subsequently gives it to Stanley; of course we find no allusion whatever to it in Major Barttelot's diary. But on the very next day (June 25th) to this above-mentioned conversation, which Major Barttelot does not consider sufficiently important to merit a word of record (!), we find in his Diary the report of another conversation with Stanley of a wholly different character. Mr. Stanley's talk with his subordinate is friendly, fatherly, full of noble sentiments and kind advice; he (the Major) is called frequently 'dear fellow' and 'my dear Major,' &c., appropriate poetry is quoted, and altogether nothing can be more sweet, friendly, or creditable to the sentiments of all concerned. But the Major's talk with Stanley, as reported by the Major himself on the following day, is quite a different sort of affair, and doesn't reflect the least credit upon either the Major or Mr. Stanley, their literary abilities or their nobility of sentiment, and it is evidently written by a man

who thought he was being very badly treated, and who, not having been accustomed to control his feelings, or to be afraid of anybody, went to his chief and, as he expresses it, 'had a row with him.' The conversation itself is so relevant to the points at issue, and so typical of the real character of both Stanley and Barttelot, that I quote it entire:

'Saturday, June 25.—I went in to see Stanley, and had a row with him. He told me I nagged at him, and if I went on we should fight; that I ought never to have come on this expedition, and that I was either naturally cross or for a purpose, and that if the former he should suspend me from all duty. The cause of it was because I told him the truth, and because Stairs had shown me a letter which Stanley had written him concerning my non-appearance.[1] He thought that Tippu had captured us, or the Soudanese had mutinied. The former I told him was absurd, and I could not understand how he could have entertained it, especially after what he had told me, viz., *that he would as soon trust Tippu Tib as a white man.* Stanley replied, 'Yes; but I would only trust a white man to a certain point, and no further, as my letter of instructions showed.' I said, 'Yes, that is the worst of it; trust me all in all, or not at all.' The day previous I told him that Tippu[2] did not trust him, and thought that he (Stanley) had broken faith with him concerning the ammunition, &c., which had fetched Stanley rather. The second proposition, as to the Soudanese mutinying, I said was equally absurd, and that when alone with me, and not continually sneered at, they did well. I asked him where his camp was going to be; he said I ought to know. 'Of course,' I said, 'I know the direction, and which shore of Albert Nyanza.' He said everybody else knew it. I replied very bitterly, 'You have told them, but not for me, you never tell me anything.' Then he burst out, and I left him. However, it did me good, and I took two podophyllin pills that night.'—Pp. 112—114, Barttelot's Diaries.

Is not the last sentence of this extract delicious?

I ask again, is it possible to believe that the man who wrote that entry in his Diary, had had on the previous day a conversation of the length and character mentioned above, in so entirely different a strain? Mr. Stanley in effect asks us to believe (unless we discredit this entry in Major Barttelot's Diary) that on June 24th he and Major Barttelot were on the best possible terms, almost like father and son, and on June 25th (as will be seen in the above extract from the Diary) they were according to Major Barttelot on the worst possible. But that is not all we can find in the extract I have quoted contradictory of the conversation reported by Mr. Stanley. We read:

'The day previous I told him that Tippu did not trust him, and thought that he (Stanley) had broken faith with him, concerning the ammunition, &c., which had fetched Stanley rather.—June 25th, Barttelot's Diaries.

[1] Major Barttelot was two days longer coming to Yambuya from Stanley Falls than Mr. Stanley expected.

[2] 'When I told Stanley this, he said he did not want Tippu Tib's aid; he could do very well without the men.'—Extract from letter to Major Sclater.

So that it appears that whatever conversation did take place on the 24th, was not of the amicable character reported, and that the only thing which Major Barttelot states as having said to Mr. Stanley on that day does not occur in the conversation given by the latter. Of course it is impossible to prove now by direct evidence whether any long conversation did or did not take place between Major Barttelot and Mr. Stanley on June 24th, but the assumptions we have to make in order to believe that the conversation given by Mr. Stanley is accurate, are, as I have shown, so tremendous, and involve such contradictions both with regard to the men and their mutual relations at that period, that we are, I think, warranted in refusing to accept Mr. Stanley's version—a version which, be it remembered, is written nearly two years after the occurrence, and has apparently no documentary evidence of any kind for its support, though on the contrary there is the documentary evidence of a negative kind in Major Barttelot's Diary which tells so strongly against it.

We now come to the last point with which I shall deal with regard to Mr. Stanley's communications with Major Barttelot, and that is the point of the two letters sent, or stated to be sent, on September 18th, 1889, and February 14th, 1888, both of which are stated to have been handed back to Mr. Stanley on August 11th, 1888, by Ugarrowwa, whose couriers had, as he informed Mr. Stanley, failed to deliver them.

Major Walter Barttelot implies, if he does not exactly state (p. 178, Barttelot's Diaries), that these letters were not sent at all, and remarks that—

> It is curious that the first we hear of these letters is that Mr. Stanley sends them home himself, directly after Major Barttelot's death, and they were published in the newspapers.

And it certainly does seem strange, though possibly explicable, that the retention of the letters by Ugarrowwa for nearly a year should be passed over by Mr. Stanley, and that Ugarrowwa should have neither acquainted Mr. Stanley with their non-delivery (up to August 1888) nor should Mr. Stanley have taken any steps to ascertain whether they had been delivered, or to send other communications to the camp at Yambuya. The sending of the letters home with the instructions to publish them in the newspapers appears to the present writer to be the least curious part of the matter. It is evidently explicable by the consideration that Mr. Stanley would naturally feel, on receiving tidings of Major Barttelot's death, that it was necessary to make out as good a case as possible for the desertion of the rear column, and to show that he had not been wanting in efforts to communicate with it

To sum up this part of my article, it is, we must confess, a little

unfortunate that nearly all the documentary evidence with which Mr. Stanley helps out his story is invariably unsupported by the accounts given by those to whom it refers, and is generally contradicted by the character of the people concerned. It is unfortunate too, that the documents are either written long after the event narrated, or consist of papers which should be in the possession, not of Mr. Stanley, but of the persons to whom they were addressed. Thus for instance, the pencilled memorandum of calculations above referred to is not only disregarded and unmentioned by the officer whom it concerned, but is not even retained by him, and the letters which Mr. Stanley writes to that officer not only never reach their destination, but also come into Mr. Stanley's hands. And it is most unfortunate of all (though I beg my readers to remember that this last point is not a conclusion for which I can give absolute proof), that all these conversations, memoranda, and letters which have been unreceived, or which are unreported by the officers to whom they were addressed, are such as seem to have been written with the one uniform purpose of establishing a certain case *for* Mr. Stanley and *against* the officers of the rear column. Indeed, so curiously do they tally with the events which took place months, and almost years after they were supposed to have been written and spoken, so complete is their vindication of Mr. Stanley's conduct, and so exhaustive their dealing with the various events which might occur (which by strange coincidence have many of them occurred since), that they scarcely appear to be possibly the result of unpremeditated conversations, or to have been written in ignorance of the course of later events. That this is so, the present writer is convinced, but the correctness of his opinion can only be gained by those who will consult the volumes of 'Darkest Africa' for themselves, and compare them with the entries in Major Barttelot's Diaries.[1]

To briefly recapitulate what has I think been proved in the foregoing article:

I. That the instructions given to Major Barttelot were carried out by him faithfully and adequately.

II. That the provision made by Mr. Stanley for forwarding the stores of the rear column was inadequate.

III. That no steps were taken by him to insure his contract with Tippu Tib being carried out, although such steps might well have been taken, and although Mr. Stanley himself asserts his belief that Tippu Tib was entirely unreliable.

[1] It is not necessary to go beyond 'Darkest Africa' itself to find Mr. Stanley's assertions contradicted—on many most important occasions he contradicts his own words most elaborately. I have referred to some of these occasions later on.—H. Q.

IV. That Mr. Stanley promised to return to the rear column in October or November 1887, and broke his word.

V. That no sufficient attempt was made by Mr. Stanley between the date of his departure from the camp at Yambuya on June 28th 1887, and the date of his return in August 1888, to preserve communications with that camp, or to afford adequate information to the commander thereof as to the whereabouts and safety of Mr. Stanley himself.

VI. That the conversations reported by Mr. Stanley as having taken place with Major Barttelot, which conversations would to a certain extent exculpate Mr. Stanley if correctly reported, are tacitly denied by the absence of all reference to them in Major Barttelot's Diaries, and are refuted by the inconsistency of the reported words with the character of Major Barttelot and Mr. Stanley, with the relations which, as Major Barttelot's Diaries uniformly show, subsisted at the times mentioned between himself and his leader, and by numerous other entries in the Major's Diaries and Letters home which detail the conversations which did actually take place, and explain the construction put by Major Barttelot upon the instructions he had received from Mr. Stanley.

VII. That unless Major Barttelot has recounted conversations which never took place, and events which never occurred, Mr. Stanley's whole account of the voyage up the Congo as far as Stanley Falls contains many material omissions, especially as regards the important events of that voyage, namely, the so-called mutiny (of Friday, May 20th) of Jephson and Stairs, and many other quarrels and disagreements between Mr. Stanley and his subordinate officers.

VIII. That nearly every entry in Major Barttelot's Diary which mentions Mr. Stanley, from the date of the arrival at Zanzibar, to the last time when the name occurs, shows that Major Barttelot was at issue with his leader, in so far as that leader's treatment of himself and his officers was concerned, but was nevertheless entirely content and determined to fulfil to the utmost of his ability the duties which were assigned to him by Mr. Stanley.

IX. That Mr. Stanley has now in a signed statement revised and altered his charges against the officers of the rear column so entirely as to render them entirely different from those he made at the time, and that the charges now made are inconsistent with the evidence he himself gives in his own book. For proof of this see the concluding portion of my article.

X. That Mr. Stanley's conduct in suppressing the reports of some of

his subordinate officers, holding over others, and revising the rest, is such as to show that he was desirous of preventing the public from being acquainted with the true facts of the case, and renders his own account of what occurred liable to grave suspicion.

XI. That in view of the unsparing censure passed by Mr. Stanley in his work of 'Darkest Africa' on the conduct of the officers of the rear column, and especially on that of Messrs. Barttelot and Jameson, it was ungenerous in the highest degree to insist upon the clause of his agreement which prevented any of those officers or their representatives from being heard in their own defence, till more than four months after the accusation had been made public.

XII. That even if that censure had been deserved in the cases of Major Barttelot and Mr. Jameson, as I have shown it was undeserved, and as accurate as I have shown it to be incorrect, it still would have been inconsistent in any man who claimed to be a loyal comrade and an English gentleman, to have made such charges on evidence which, on Mr. Stanley's own showing, was partial and incomplete, against two officers who had lost their lives in his service, and against whose *bonâ fides* and fidelity he himself several times admits there was not a single word to be said.

XIII. That Mr. Stanley's later conduct in meeting the publication of Major Barttelot's Diaries and the revelations contained therein, not by a frank and direct denial of the facts alleged, but by a further series of vague and horrible insinuations concerning Major Barttelot's conduct, and by leaving for America with those insinuations unexplained, and the facts alleged against him (Mr. Stanley) uncontradicted, was shifty, if not dishonourable, and justifies us in concluding that he was anxious to evade the justification of his charges, and either wait until the public interest in the subject had dropped, or ride off upon new issues, in the interest of which his own conduct would be forgotten.[1]

XIV. That even in the few days which have elapsed since these later insinuations of Mr. Stanley's against Major Barttelot's character, the most important of them, and the only definite one, *i.e.*, that relating to his murder by Sanga, has been proved to be false by the confession of Sanga himself, on the authority of the President of the Court Martial by whom Sanga was tried and condemned.

XV. That the state of the camp at Banalya and the condition of the rear column when met by Mr. Stanley could not fairly be charged to the account of Major Barttelot, who had not been in that camp for three weeks before he was murdered, and who had only been

[1] This was written, it must be remembered, before the latest accusations and statements of Mr. Stanley to the *Times* interviewer.

there for two nights in the seven weeks previous to Mr. Stanley's arrival, which took place one month after the murder.

XVI. That the officer who was responsible for the state of things found by Mr. Stanley, whether horrible or reverse, was Mr. Bonny, who had been in command for two months (except for thirty-six hours), whom Mr. Stanley has since rewarded with a donation of £200, and on whose report Mr. Stanley chiefly relies to justify his accusations against Major Barttelot.

XVII. That Mr. Stanley's publication of the log kept by Mr. Bonny from July 11th to the date of Major Barttelot's murder, July 19th, does not give on the three crucial days, July 17th, 18th, and 19th, the entries made by Mr. Bonny at all, but simply refers readers to chapter xx. vol. i. 'In Darkest Africa,' in which appears Mr. Bonny's official report 'in a revised form.' See for proof of this the missing entries in the log, which should be on p. 513, vol. i., and the official report, p. 490, vol. i.

XVIII. That Mr. Troup's report of the events which happened while he was with the rear column at Yambuya was also suppressed by Mr. Stanley, first on the ground of intemperance of language, secondly on the ground of length and argument, and thirdly because Mr. Troup declined to confine it to 'two sheets,' and omit therefrom 'any argument whatever.' (The proof of these facts relating to Mr. Troup is to be found in his correspondence[1] with Mr. Stanley, published in chapter xviii. and the appendices to his work, 'With Stanley's Rear Column,' pp. 276–305.) The suppressed report also appears in Appendix A of the same work, but it must be noted that the report has been to some extent modified by Mr. Troup in order to meet Mr. Stanley's later statements. I have not embodied Mr. Troup's various allegations and accusations in the argument of my article, as I have preferred to base it entirely upon evidence which is uncontradicted and which appears in its original form.

XIX. That Mr. Stanley's first action, as described by himself, on arriving at Zanzibar was to obtain an important concession of territory for the Imperial British East Africa Company.

XX. That the Directors of the Imperial British East Africa Company are in the main the same people who constituted the moving spirits of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition.[2]

[1] I believe Mr. Stanley admits the accuracy of these letters as far as they go, but alleges that there are material omissions therein.—H.Q.

[2] It must not be forgotten that these gentlemen have expressly denied any other interest than a philanthropic one in their connection with the E. P. Relief Expedition. I do not attempt to reconcile these facts. I quote them.—H.Q.

XXI. That seventy-five tons of ivory, value at present price of 12*s.* per pound, £100,000, were supposed by Mr. Stanley and by the Emin Pasha Relief Committee to be in the possession of Emin Pasha.

XXII. That the Emin Pasha Relief Committee contemplated the annexation of a 'just proportion' of that ivory, and even went so far as to stipulate with Her Majesty's Government (see letter of March 25th from the Emin Pasha Committee to the Foreign Office, p. 410, Barttelot's Diaries) that that Government should cause the Egyptian Government to acknowledge the justice of this claim, lest there should be any 'misunderstanding in the future' as to the partition of the spoil.

XXIII. That the idea that Emin Pasha himself might prefer to retain, or had any claim to, the ivory in question does not seem to have occurred to either Mr. Stanley or the Emin Pasha Committee, and probably not to Her Majesty's Government, although on this last-mentioned point we can only presume, from the silence maintained, that no objection was made.

XXIV. That the second thing Mr. Stanley did on arriving at Zanzibar was to settle a little business for the King of the Belgians, by which Tippu Tib was made governor of the Falls Station, and was expressly confirmed in the permission to practise his 'private trade'—*i.e.* ivory and slave-catching—in any direction, and to send his caravans to and from any places he may desire (page 402, Barttelot's Diaries).

XXV. That in furtherance of this contract Mr. Stanley conveyed Tippu Tib and his followers, boarding them free of expense in the steamer provided for the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition, from Zanzibar to Stanley Falls Station, a distance of, say, between three and four thousand miles; a nice little pleasure trip at the expense of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition, for which we hope that Tippu Tib or his employer, King Leopold, was proportionately grateful.

XXVI. That, having regard to the importance of these transactions and their value to the persons concerned, it is not unfair to suppose that Mr. Stanley's services were not alone recompensed by that sense of duty done to which he so frequently and proudly alludes; and also that, considering his intimate relations with Tippu Tib, and the obligations which that merchant in human flesh was under to him, he would have been able, had he greatly desired it, to ensure the latter's performance of the contract made for the supply of the requisite number of carriers, or, in other words, to have ensured the safe conveyance to the front of the stores of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition.

XXVII. That the officers engaged by Mr. Stanley in the Expedition were kept by him in ignorance of many of his real designs, and were used by him for the furtherance of designs which were not contemplated by them when they entered upon the Expedition; which were not rightly to be included in their agreement to serve Mr. Stanley, and the prosecution of which, to no inconsiderable degree, was responsible for the disasters of the rear column, and the death of those two officers whose conduct has been our chief subject of discussion in the foregoing article.[1]

The whole of the foregoing article, which was commenced on Tuesday afternoon (Nov. 4th) at four o'clock, and sent to the printers in batches as finished, was concluded yesterday (Friday, the 7th) afternoon at the same hour. Half an hour afterwards I saw the evening papers of that day, in which were accounts of an interview with Mr. Stanley, and this (Saturday) morning I have read the detailed and signed statement dictated by Mr. Stanley to a correspondent of the *Times* at the Everett House, New York, and cabled by him to England in the course of the following day. I see no reason to alter a single word of what has been written above in view of this latest declaration of Mr. Stanley's; but as it takes up ground which is to a very considerable extent new, and as I suppose we are to read it as we read the later of two wills, *i.e.* as superseding the original statement, it is necessary for me, if the case is to be presented completely to our readers, to deal with its assertions, and to some extent in detail. As there is but a very brief space for this answer, I shall not here give the authorities for my assertions in detail, or verify my arguments by long quotations. I do state, however, that no fact will be advanced herein which cannot be supported by printed and published statements of the people concerned in this controversy; and that on the hearsay evidence of which almost the entire series of charges given by Mr. Stanley in this morning's *Times* is composed, I shall admit no single instance. First, for the sake of clearness, let us take what are Mr. Stanley's new charges, and what is the authority on which he makes them. I shall divide them as follows:—

I. Charges made on hearsay evidence from Mr. Bonny. II. Charges made on hearsay evidence from anonymous correspondents—or, to be quite precise, from correspondents who are anonymous in this signed statement of Mr. Stanley's. III. Charges made on written or printed authorities to which it is possible to turn for verification of Mr. Stanley's statements.

[1] Be it noted that the adoption of the Congo route appears easily explicable if Mr. Stanley's presence at Zanzibar was necessary for the above-mentioned purposes, and especially if he was to establish Tippu Tib in his new governorship at Stanley Falls—but hardly otherwise.—H.Q.

I express each charge in the fewest possible words, but the list I give is, to the best of my belief, complete.

I.—*Charges made on Mr. Bonny's Authority.*[1]

1. That Major Barttelot told Mr. Bonny he suspected Stanley of being a poisoner. 2. That Major Barttelot had recommended his brother, Mr. Walter Barttelot, to look after Lieutenant Troup on the arrival of the latter in England, in order that Troup might not be tempted to disclose what was going on at Yambuya with the rear column. 3. That Major Barttelot informed Mr. Bonny, confidentially, of a plan to start with Jameson an expedition of their own, and offered to take Bonny with them. 4. That Major Barttelot confessed to Mr. Bonny he would be dismissed from the service if what he had done at Yambuya was known in England. 5. That Major Barttelot attempted to get Mr. Bonny to give him a medical certificate in order that he might leave the expedition and go home.

II.—*Statements made on Anonymous Information.*[1]

1. That Major Barttelot was caught tasting cyanide of potassium to see if its taste could be detected in a cup of coffee, and that he intended to poison with that drug Tippu Tib's nephew. 2. That Major Barttelot's life was saved twice by Mr. Bonny, one occasion being when Major Barttelot had 'suddenly seized a woman and fastened his teeth in her shoulder.' 3. That Major Bartelott would stand in front of the natives grinning like a fiend; that he would run about the camp prodding the natives, and hitting them indiscriminately with a steel-pointed cypress staff; that he prodded one man seventeen times on the day before he was killed; that he kicked a little boy of ten years old, named Soudy, to death; that he flogged another lad with 300 lashes, and so caused his death; that he tortured a Soudanese soldier by sending him on guard when suffering from the tortures of hunger; that he then flogged him with 150 lashes for stealing a piece of goat's flesh, and that when he subsequently deserted, had him searched for, caught, tried, and shot; that many natives had horrible ulcers on their backs and limbs owing to Major Barttelot's remorseless punishments; and that, as he had sent away the medicines, many died from that cause. 4. That Major Barttelot in connection with Mr. Jameson formed various projects which amounted to the betrayal of their posts on the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition; and that they consulted Tippu Tib, who agreed to accompany them for £3,000. 5. That Jameson said in confidence to some unnamed person, who told

[1] Since writing the above the signed statement of Mr. Bonny in the *Times* has shown that many of the charges made under my second heading were also made by Mr. Stanley on Mr. Bonny's authority. I suspected this at the time, but in quoting Mr. Stanley's assertions it is not wise to trust to conjecture.—H.Q.

Mr. Stanley, that many things were done by Major Barttelot which did not meet with his approbation. 6. That Major Barttelot bought four slave chains from Tippu Tib, for the purpose of putting the people in irons. 7. That Major Barttelot's murder was caused by his beating Sanga's wife with a steel-pointed staff, and then kicking her, and that Mr. Stanley would have acquitted him (Sanga) on the evidence before him.

III.—*Charges made on Written or Published Articles*

That Major Barttelot made a determination on December 6th never to partake again of Stanley's hospitality (pp. 169 and 170 Barttelot's Diary). (For the explanation of the purpose of this quotation, see the charge of suspecting Mr. Stanley to be a poisoner quoted above on Bonny's authority.)

The above are all the charges made against Major Barttelot in this astounding statement of Mr. Stanley's; but there is another charge made against Mr. Jameson which even excels the above.[1] Mr. Stanley asserts it on the authority of a man who was an eye-witness, who he states has drawn up an affidavit in the presence of witnesses to the effect that Mr. Jameson purchased a young girl and had her deliberately murdered in front of him while he stood sketching her, making six or seven sketches of her death and of the act of cannibalism which followed. Mr. Stanley's account does not state that he had actually seen the affidavit or even the man who made it; or whether the man who made it is a European, a Zanzibari, a Soudanese, or an Arab. He only states that the affidavit has been made.[2]

Our readers are now in a position to judge what is Mr. Stanley's defence to the facts which we have proved in the preceding article. His

[1] There are also several charges relating to the conduct of Mr. Herbert Ward, quoted by Mr. Stanley in his statement (*Times*, Nov. 8th), which Mr. Ward has since not only denied the truth of (*Times*, Nov. 10th), but of which he has to-day (Nov. 12th) given a full explanation, which renders it difficult to believe that Major Barttelot ever alleged that he was guilty of them. It is at least curious that the proof Mr. Stanley cites in connection with the above incident—namely, Mr. Jameson's letter of Aug. 12th, 1888, for which he refers his readers to 'Darkest Africa'—contains no single word of reference to this alleged theft of Mr. Ward's, although such reference may possibly have been made in the original document, for, as usual with the papers quoted by Mr. Stanley, a letter appears in 'Darkest Africa' with several hiatuses.—H.Q.

[2] It is now *admitted* that this affidavit referred to was made by Assad Faran, a Syrian interpreter who was discharged from the Expedition for theft, and it is asserted by Mrs. Jameson and others that the above-named acknowledged the falsity of his charge, and that his retractation is in the hands of the Emin Relief Committee. It is in support of Mr. Stanley's statement as to the truth of this charge against Mr. Jameson that Mr. Bonny volunteers his most important evidence (*Times*, Monday, Nov. 10th), stating that there 'can be no doubt as to the absolute correctness of Mr. Stanley's statement,' and that 'Mr. Jameson himself related to me (Bonny) every incident as described by Mr. Stanley.' This assertion, sufficiently incredible in itself when we consider the awful character of the deed attributed to Mr. Jameson, is absolutely contradicted by the correspondence he sent home, by the confession of the interpreter above alluded to, and by Lieut. Troup's own account (*Times*, Nov. 12th) of the interview at which Mr. Jameson showed the sketches in question, and explicitly stated that he had not seen 'the actual killing of the girl,' and that he only came up when the natives were feasting.—H.Q.

defence is that Major Barttelot was, in intention, a murderer, and in act an inhuman tyrant, and that his friend Mr. Jameson was a beast, the unnatural barbarity of whose action words must fail to express, and that Ward, Troup and Bonny were witnesses to these awful cruelties without making any remonstrance against them; and these things he asserts on the authority of Mr. Bonny's word, and of information conveyed to him by various unnamed persons.

We will very shortly examine some of these accusations in detail, but let me first point out that, granting every word to be true of Mr. Stanley's statement, no exculpation for his action is in the least degree attained thereby. Nay—that the more entirely we believe that Major Barttelot was the fiend in human form which Mr. Stanley declares him to have been, the more culpable must we consider Mr. Stanley in leaving him in charge of 227 natives, and in chief command of the Yambuya camp, the officers of the rear column, and the stores which were essential to the safety of the expedition. Ample opportunities had been afforded Mr. Stanley on the voyage from Zanzibar to Stanley Falls of becoming acquainted with Major Barttelot's character, and of witnessing his method of dealing with the natives.[1] Is it credible that even Mr. Stanley can wish us to believe that Major Barttelot's character changed entirely after Stanley's departure from Yambuya, and that he suddenly developed a passion for tyrannous cruelty, treachery, and murder, of which he had before then given no indications? No—such could not have been the case; and Mr. Stanley must either accept the alternative of having placed an entirely unfit man in command with a reckless indifference as to what his behaviour would be, or assert that the Major was deliberately playing a part during his association with Mr. Stanley and succeeded in completely deceiving him as to his real character. The alternative is not a nice one for a gentleman who claims so loudly to be a capable leader, and so considerate for the safety and welfare of his subordinates. There is, it is true, a third view possible, and one for which I shall attempt to show there is no small amount of evidence—which is, that the charges brought by Mr. Stanley on these shadowy grounds are not true, that the events he has been told as occurring did not occur, and that Messrs. Barttelot and Jameson were not the cowardly treacherous brutes which Mr. Stanley believes them to be on the evidence of an ex-sergeant of the Army Hospital Corps, but such as their old military and sporting comrades have proved them to be through long years of service and

[1] Indeed this point of Barttelot's hastiness and injudicious treatment of natives had been common knowledge in the Soudan, and General Brackenbury cautioned Mr. Stanley on this very head to the effect that Major Barttelot was not perhaps a fitting man to go on the expedition at all, or at all events, if he did go that he would require careful supervision. The poor chap was only a braw, hasty, impetuous boy.—H.Q.

faithfully-shared peril, honourable English gentlemen, hasty and harsh on occasion perhaps, but wholly incapable of the crimes attributed to them. Probably the quickest way of disposing of Mr. Stanley's charges will be to take first those which can be actually disproved by published evidence. Of these by far the most important is Mr. Stanley's charge concerning the murder of Major Barttelot; and note that the charge is not only the most important on account of its gravity, but also because the published evidence concerning it must have been known to Mr. Stanley, since it was published in the *New York Herald* of November 2, and is nevertheless in direct conflict with the account which Mr. Stanley gives on November 8.

Mr. Stanley explains the murder by an elaborate account of the injuries inflicted by the Major on the wife of the murderer, states in detail how the crime was committed, and justifies it by saying he would have acquitted the murderer, when he knows that the president of the court-martial which tried and convicted Sanga gives an entirely different account, and states explicitly that Major Barttelot only raised his stick to the woman instead of knocking her down, beating, and kicking her, and that the murderer himself in his confession alleged no other provocation than that first-mentioned, and stated the manner in which he committed the crime, which differs entirely from Mr. Stanley's account. Thus the very assassin whom Mr. Stanley justifies, contradicts him *toto cælo*, and the president of the court-martial emphasizes the contradiction by saying that Sanga would never have shot Major Barttelot at all had he not thought that, according to the custom of his tribe, a money penalty would be the only punishment inflicted upon him. Let us try and understand what this one instance of Mr. Stanley's method of argument really implies. It implies this—that with the actual proceedings of the trial in front of him, and the actual words of the murderer ringing in his ears, he can yet give to the English public a story which is wholly inconsistent with the proved testimony, in order to try and justify the savage, and blacken the character of his assassinated subordinate, and he can do this on what authority? He has not even the authority of Mr. Bonny himself, for Mr. Bonny was in his hut when the deed took place, and knew nothing about it. In Mr. Stanley's statement it simply appears as an indubitable fact that this happened—against all the published evidence. Where did he get his information? He does not tell us, and his account is absolutely contradicted by the evidence at the trial. Nay, it is more than contradicted in one important essential. Its possibility is disproved, for Mr. Stanley asserts that Sanga's shot was fired from the interior of a hut against Major

Barttelot, who was standing in the open ground, and the evidence of all the eye-witnesses given at the trial, as well as that of Sanga himself, states that the murderer was out in the open, and thrust the muzzle of his gun so close against Major Barttelot's breast that the Major's very clothes were burnt by the discharge. Now no doubt it is possible that some such account as that quoted by Mr. Stanley was furnished to him by the relatives and friends of the murderer, but can we excuse Mr. Stanley for quoting it as proven fact when he has before him the results of the trial, and the confession of the murderer himself? And if Mr. Stanley will thus falsify, or at all events neglect, the value of testimony which tells against him in such a case as this, how are we to believe him when he quotes other hearsay evidence, especially when it refers to reported conversations in which the chief interlocutor is dead, and to occurrences which are incapable of verification. Now, before we enter upon the chief charges which are left to consider, let us say a few words as to the nature of the authority on which they are made. The reader who notices how many things are here attributed to information supplied by Mr. Bonny, and how many charges rest upon the unsupported testimony of that gentleman, will naturally like to know a little as to what that gentleman's place in the expedition was, who he is, and why we are justified in attaching so much value to his unsupported evidence; and also though it is, we confess, rather hard upon Mr. Bonny that he should thus be made the scapegoat of Mr. Stanley's assertions, we must, I think, ask whether it is reasonable to believe that his testimony may have been affected by other considerations than those of pure veracity, and whether he had not some ends to serve of personal exculpation or personal advantage, in thus becoming Mr. Stanley's witness.[1]

Well, then, who is Mr. Bonny, and what was his position in the expedition? He is stated to be an ex-sergeant of the Army Hospital Corps, a paid servant of Mr. Stanley's, engaged as an assistant to Surgeon Parke, or in other words, as occupying a wholly subordinate position in the expedition. What salary he received does not appear in the extremely unexplanatory statement of expenses made by Mr. Stanley, but it does appear that £242 was paid to him for balance of salary, and that also £200 was paid to him as a *first* donation[1] to William Bonny, Esq. The whole question of these first donations which are given to Stairs, Jephson, Nelson, Parke, and Bonny appears to me a very curious one, it being especially wonderful that Mr. Bonny, who was one of the officers of the rear column, and was in that capacity included in the censure passed by Stanley on those officers, should receive for his dereliction of

[1] The italics are mine.—H. Q.

duty a first donation of £200, while the unfortunate Lieutenant Troup and Mr. Ward have been passed over altogether; nor does it quite appear why this first donation should not be followed, indeed the wording of the gift would seem to imply that it was to be, by a second, third, or even fourth donation, for I notice that there is an insignificant balance of nearly £5,000[1] which is unaccounted for in Mr. Stanley's statement of expenses.

Apart from this, however, has Mr. Bonny no more pressing reason to take a somewhat partial view of Major Barttelot's conduct? Let us consider. Major Barttelot left the rear column on June 24th, 1888, and only returned to it on July 17th. He was shot on the night he returned and murdered in the early morning of July 19th, or in other words, when he had been about thirty-six hours in the camp. Mr. Stanley joined the rear column on August 17th, that is to say, that for seven weeks and five days before he arrived with the exception of thirty-six hours, Mr. William Bonny had been the commanding officer, and the only European in the camp. To whom then is the state of that camp due when Mr. Stanley arrives? To the man who has been murdered a month previously, and had nothing to do with the camp's maintenance and discipline for all but two months, *or to the officer who has been commanding during that period?* And has that officer no direct interest of the most imperative and personal kind to represent the conduct of his former leader as having been of such a character as to have produced the state of disorganization which Mr. Stanley finds to prevail when he returns to the camp? Must we not admit that, unless he can prove Barttelot to have been extraordinarily in the wrong, he must accuse himself of being responsible for the lack of discipline, and state of sickness and suffering which prevailed on the chief leader's return? His testimony is tainted testimony by that fact alone; but does Mr. Stanley regard it as so being, and is there any mention in Mr. Stanley's statement of the time during which Mr. William Bonny had commanded in Barttelot's absence, and after Barttelot's death? There is none; but there is, on the other hand, the direct attribution of the misery prevailing at Banalya to Major Barttelot himself.

Moreover, since we must in fairness to the dead men set down everything that can fairly tell in their favour, we must mention the evidence there is to show that Mr. Bonny had cause to feel a personal prejudice against Major Barttelot. The truth is, Mr. Bonny is not, or rather was not, from Major Barttelot's point of view, of officer rank, and

[1] See Appendix D, Statement of the Emin Pasha Relief Fund, where the subscriptions appear as £33,268 12*s.*, and the expenses as £27,709 9*s.* 5*d.*, to which last item is to be added the sum of 10,000 rupees, or say £800 (pp. 451-2, vol. ii. 'Darkest Africa').—H.Q.

Major Barttelot, one of whose worst faults seems to have been a rather touchy and wrong-headed sort of pride, allowed Mr. Bonny to discover that such was his opinion, and that he did not care to associate with him. It is pardonable enough, if one considers the usual attitude of military men towards the medical officers even of their own regiments, that Major Barttelot should have considered the non-commissioned officer, assistant of Surgeon Parke, as scarcely on a social equality with himself.[1] No doubt it would have been nobler, and as the event proves, it would have been far wiser, to have forgotten all social differences in the light of a common enterprise, and a common community of danger. But he could not forget it, and he turned for companionship to the one social equal who was in the camp, *i.e.* to Mr. Jameson.

We have here three distinct motives for hesitating to admit the impartiality of Mr. Bonny's testimony. We find that he was the paid servant of Mr. Stanley, and the *only member of the rear column rewarded by that gentleman.*[2] We find that unless he could shift the responsibility from his shoulders, he would have to be held accountable for the state of the camp which he had for nearly two months commanded, and we find, lastly, that he had private and particular reasons for being on bad terms with, and feeling extremely sore against, his commanding officer. Should not Mr. Stanley under such circumstances have withheld his hand from the publication of any charges made by Mr. Bonny unless such were supported by direct and incontrovertible evidence? But the merest glance at the list published above of the accusations made by Mr. Stanley against Major Barttelot will show that a very considerable number of them are not only due to the information supplied by Mr. Bonny, but are the reports of private conversations, alleged by him to have taken place between himself and Major Barttelot, for which no other evidence whatever could possibly exist.

Leaving therefore for the moment Mr. Bonny's accusations, let us take those which Mr. Stanley makes on anonymous information; the first of which is the cyanide of potassium story. This almost reads like the account of a scene in a comic opera, but it is worth while examining the charge, if only to show how many assumptions are contained therein. Thus: Major Barttelot is *caught* tasting cyanide of potassium. Who catches him we do not hear. And why should he not taste cyanide of

[1] Worth remembering, perhaps, that it would have been an actual breach of discipline for Major Barttelot to have sat at the same 'mess' with Mr. Bonny in England, or on any military service.—H.Q.

[2] It now appears from the statement in the *Times* of to-day (Nov. 12th), signed by Mr. Herbert Ward, that there was an honorarium presented to him by the Emin Pasha Relief Committee of £300, though of course, as no mention was made of this in Mr. Stanley's statement of expenses above quoted, I was justified in presuming that the statement in the text was correct.—H. Q.

potassium if he likes? Because, says Mr. Stanley practically, he was tasting it to discover whether the presence of that drug would be ascertainable in a cup of coffee. But how in the name of all that's possible could Mr. Stanley know, or any human being know, unless Major Barttelot had actually told him, that he was actuated by such a reason? Does Mr. Stanley intend us to believe that Major Barttelot turned round to the person who caught him tasting this potassium, and said, as it were: 'Look here, I am tasting this because I intend to poison Tippu Tib's nephew in a cup of coffee with it, and want to find out whether it would alter the flavour'? Put in this way, the accusation seems as ludicrous as it is impossible. It contains its own refutation. Why, then, is this charge set down so deliberately in a signed statement? It is difficult to avoid thinking that the object is merely to excite a general prejudice against Major Barttelot by repeating any story, no matter how incredible or self-contradictory, which Mr. Stanley can get hold of.[1]

The next series of charges, as to the persecution of the natives, and Major Barttelot's conduct towards them, are evidently not to be disproved in the same fashion as the above. But even here, as against these unsupported and hearsay statements, made subsequently to the events in question, we have no less than three direct pieces of evidence, with the authority of Mr. Ward, of Lieutenant Troup, and of Major Barttelot himself. It is true that the last-named evidence is only indirect, since it consists in entries from the deceased officer's Diary, entries which were of course made in ignorance of the charges which were to be made against him. What, then, do Messrs. Ward and Troup state with regard to these perpetual cruelties with which Mr. Stanley charges Major Barttelot? In an interview with Mr. Ward, published in the *Sunday Times* of November 9th, Mr. Ward states explicitly, when asked whether there was not reason for Mr. Stanley to be horrified at the continuous cruelties that went on in the camp, that up to the time of his departure in March, he saw nothing done that he had not 'seen Stanley do himself, or that called for condemnation.' And again, he denies absolutely that up to the same date there was any dishonourable conduct on Major Barttelot's part. Now Mr. Ward left Yambuya camp on March 28th, 1888, and Major Barttelot took command of Yambuya camp, June 28th, 1887; he had therefore been nine months in command at the date of Ward's departure, during which time we have Ward's testimony that, as far as his personal knowledge extended, nothing had been done at Yambuya which he (Ward) considered wrong, or which he

[1] This story becomes still more incredible in Mr. Bonny's detailed version. See the *Times*, Nov. 10th, where Major Barttelot is actually made to tell Mr. Bonny his intention almost as I have suggested above.—H. Q.

had not seen Stanley do himself. Again, what is Lieutenant Troup's testimony on the same point? I quote from the same newspaper from a Reuter's telegram of an interview with Lieutenant Troup in New York, November 8th.

When Stanley charges me with cowardice and indifference to the fate of the natives of our guard, he known he is not telling the truth. This is provable from inquiry. They were treated as kindly as if they had been Europeans. It is true they were punished in order that discipline might be maintained, but the reason of that punishment was explained to them, so that there could be no misunderstanding.

And again, after charging the misery and starvation in the camp, at all events partly, to Mr. Stanley's own action in leaving the camp unprovided with proper supplies, Mr. Troup asserts that Major Barttelot

'felt that perhaps the fate of the entire expedition depended upon absolute obedience to Mr. Stanley's orders, and like a good soldier, he obeyed orders. . . . Barttelot actually starved himself, and did not ask the men to suffer any privation which he did not endure himself.'

Surely these statements are sufficiently explicit, but fortunately there is, if possible, more convincing testimony to be given against these accusations of indiscriminate cruelty, since it is given by Mr. Stanley himself in his own work of 'Darkest Africa,' and in words which very curiously happen to be quite precise and unmistakeable in their meaning. These occur in Mr. Stanley's report of his conversation with the Zanzibaris of the rear column on August 21st, 1888, p. 6, vol. ii., 'Darkest Africa,' immediately after Mr. Stanley's meeting with the rear column. After Mr. Stanley has cross-questioned a group of these Zanzibaris, and they have attributed the deaths at the camp to eating of improperly prepared manioc, we find the following words :—

MR. STANLEY: 'And you say it was not by the stick, or hard work, or cholera, small-pox, fever, dysentery, or climate?'

FERAJII: 'Nothing of any of those things killed the Zanzibaris.'

MR. STANLEY: 'Were they shot, or hanged, poisoned, or drowned?'

FERAJII: 'Neither was any of those things done unto them, and a proper and good man was never punished, and we had one day out of seven in the week to ourselves.'

Think what this means: Mr. Stanley receives direct information from the Zanzibaris themselves, directly the rear column meets him, as to the reason of the mortality at Yambuya, and as to the character of the treatment which the natives experienced there. He remembers this information so accurately as to give the very words of the conversation in which it was conveyed to him, when he writes his book nearly two years subsequently. And then, a few months later, he contradicts this

very account by accusing Barttelot of cruelties inconsistent with what he has published himself.

Let us understand clearly: the Zanzibaris muster before Mr. Stanley to pour their complaints and miseries into his ears; they are interrogated carefully as to whether they have any ground of complaint against their commanding officer on the score of cruelty and oppression. They answer distinctly, No: that they have none. They state the cause of their sufferings to have been hunger, and the disease caused by the poisoned manioc,[1] and the thieves who accompanied the expedition, and Mr. Stanley believes them, and enters their evidence in his book to that effect; and then, two years later, he writes all these horrible charges of cruelty, leaving it to be inferred that he received the account of them from the men of the rear column at the time. We have therefore, as against these later statements of Mr. Stanley, the direct evidence of Mr. Ward, the direct evidence of Lieutenant Troup, the direct evidence of the Zanzibaris themselves, as given by Mr. Stanley, and we have also the indirect but very important evidence of Major Barttelot himself as set down in his Diary. Can there be any doubt as to which way the balance of testimony inclines? It is worth noting in connection with this fact, that Mr. Bonny is no sooner left alone with the Zanzibaris than his first day's march to the eastward is 'the signal for his total abandonment by them,' page 2, vol. ii., 'Darkest Africa.' Also, if we may trust Mr. Bonny's log, on his second day's march, July 12, 1888,

> The Arabs who joined with the Zanzibaris deserted after leading us an hour on the wrong road, and, blocking up the right ones in several places ran away.—P. 513, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa.'

And it is further to be noticed that Mr. Bonny's log[2] of August 20, the day on which the conversation reported above took place between Mr. Stanley and Ferajii, has the following entry:—

> Soudanese and Zanzibaris paraded to-day on their own accord before Mr. Stanley, and complained to him that they had been badly treated.—P. 516, vol. i., 'Darkest Africa.'

This entry, it will be observed, is not in correspondence with Mr. Stanley's account: the Zanzibaris do not complain that they have been badly treated, but they do complain that they were insufficiently provided with provisions, and we have seen above, that, according to Mr. Herbert Ward's statement, this is, at all events, partially to be attributed to Mr. Stanley himself.

[1] It is notable that this manioc is only poisonous when improperly prepared, and that the preparation of it was known to Mr. Stanley.

[2] Mr. Stanley and Mr. Bonny here differ as to the day on which this conversation took place.

I have now met, by reference to published testimony, authenticated by the names of the witnesses, a good many of the principal statements of Mr. Stanley in accusation of Major Barttelot. I have shown that Mr. Stanley's account of Major Barttelot's murder is incorrect, and must have been known to be incorrect by Mr. Stanley when he made it on Thursday last. I have shown that the account Mr. Stanley now gives as to the state of the camp at Yambuya while under Major Barttelot's command is inconsistent with that which he himself (Stanley) gave in his own book as the information furnished to him at the time by the natives themselves. I have shown that the record of Major Barttelot's (supposed) cruelties, as elaborated by Mr. Stanley, is directly denied by Mr. Herbert Ward, Lieutenant Troup, and the Zanzibari headman Ferajii. I have shown that Mr. Bonny's testimony, however honest it may be in intention, is open to great objections on the score of partiality, since, 1st, it is the testimony of one who can only exculpate himself at the expense of another; 2nd, of a paid servant who has received special favours from Mr. Stanley; and, 3rd, because Mr. Bonny had personal grounds for ill feeling against Major Barttelot. I have shown also that when Mr. Bonny is left in command after Major Barttelot's death, his men desert, and that there is therefore *prima facie* evidence to suppose that the disorganisation of the camp was in great measure due to his lack of discipline. I have shown the story of the plan to poison Tippu Tib's nephew by cyanide of potassium to be, on the face of it, absurd; and I have only left unnoticed those accusations which refer to the alleged cruelty and to the plans said to have been made by Major Barttelot and Mr. Jameson for the abandonment of the expedition and the camp, as I consider those to be sufficiently refuted by the published and undisputed records of the endeavours made by these officers to carry out Mr. Stanley's orders, and especially to guarantee by their personal credit the sum necessary to obtain the means of doing so. How any sane human being can imagine that those records are compatible with the projects alluded to by Mr. Stanley the present writer at all events cannot conceive. And it is specially notable that in his letters to his private friends, to his father, and to the President of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition, Major Barttelot furnishes day after day, during his whole stay at Yambuya, but one connected proof of his intention to carry out Mr. Stanley's orders in every detail and to the fullest possible extent.

It must be remembered that what will probably prove to be the most convincing testimony to the uprightness of the conduct of Messrs. Barttelot and Jameson, viz., the publication of Mr. Jameson's Diaries, has not yet taken place. If those Diaries bear out, as I am assured by a

person who has read them they do bear out, Major Barttelot's own words, the body of testimony in his favour may be deemed to be complete. As it is, the case against him reveals itself to be unsupported by any evidence worthy of the name, and to consist of charges so monstrous, so inconsistent with his previous reputation, so incongruous with the character of an English officer and a gentleman, and so contradicted by his private correspondence and his Diary, that they will be scarcely credible, though one had risen from the grave to make them. And if I have said less about the accusations against Mr. Jameson, it is not because I think them less scandalous or more probable, but because I feel I have no right to anticipate the word of his relatives, or his own written testimony, in the Diary which is shortly to be published.

With the best will in the world, I find it impossible to keep pace with the developments taking place every day in this Stanley affair. Even while I was writing the above, there appears in the *Times* the very detailed and precise statement of Mr. Bonny which repeats in other words Mr. Stanley's accusations. It must be borne in mind that this repetition was practically a foregone conclusion, for Mr. Stanley's statement rested almost entirely on what he had heard from Mr. Bonny, and he would certainly never have dared to make that information public had he not been sure of the confirmation of the latter gentleman.

It is also now announced that Mr. Stanley has taken legal proceedings against Major Walter Barttelot for libel, so that the whole matter will be thrashed out in Court. Let us hope that it will be thrashed out completely, and that the evidence will show not only what was the conduct of Major Barttelot in disciplinary matters, but also what were the circumstances in which he was placed by Mr. Stanley, and whether if he was driven mad, as the *Times* kindly asserts in his excuse, the desertion of the rear column and its semi-starvation were not considerable factors in producing his mania. I am fortunate in being now able to give two items of information to our readers which have not, I believe, as yet been made public. The first concerns the nature of the suppressed passages in Major Barttelot's Diary, which I am assured by Major Walter Barttelot contained no material matter except with regard to the accusation of theft of the brass rods (of which mention has been so frequently made lately) by Mr. Ward, and the statement that Major Barttelot's suspicions were due in this matter *to a story told him by Mr. Bonny himself;* Mr. Bonny, in fact, seems to have been tale-bearer in general to the camp, for we notice other extracts in the published portion of Major Barttelot's Diary in which that officer receives information from Mr. Bonny. It seems at least possible that if Bonny told Barttelot

and Ward things about Stanley, as appears in the Diary, and Stanley things about Barttelot and Jameson, as he confesses himself, that he was in the habit of telling the other subordinate officers similar tales, and that therefore much of the friction between the officers of the rear column was due to his action. I understand also that there are some passages omitted from the private letters quoted by Major Barttelot which refer to Mr. Stanley, but that they only concern his toilet apparatus, and are not of such a character as to render it probable he would regret their omission.

With regard to Mr. Jameson's Diary, I have also been furnished with the following information on what appears to me excellent authority, though I am not at liberty to disclose its source—namely, that this Diary was, together with some private correspondence of Mr. Jameson's, sealed up by Mr. Bonny after Mr. Jameson's death, and on Mr. Stanley's arrival the box was handed to him. I understand that Mr. Stanley broke the seals, or at all events opened the box, and presumably read the papers; but what I am entitled to assert definitely is that, instead of, as would seem natural, forwarding the Diary and letters immediately to Mr. Jameson's family, he retained them in his possession, and only parted with them after he had received several applications, including a lawyer's letter. First, Sir Francis de Winton was appealed to by Mr. Jameson's brother to use his influence with Stanley to obtain the papers, and agreed to do so, but with no effect. Second, a polite letter was written by Mr. A. Jameson's lawyer to Stanley himself, but also obtained 'no timely response.' Third, proceedings were commenced, and notice served of what the family intended to do if the Diary was not handed over, whereupon Mr. Stanley wrote sundry letters to them, and delivered the Diaries and papers over to the care of the Ottoman Bank, from whom the Jamesons ultimately received them. My informant further adds that it was the case Mr. Stanley opened and read the Diary, and made extracts from it. With this last item of information I must here close this already overlong article. I have little doubt but that Mr. Stanley will be able to justify, in his own peculiar manner, even this last interference with Mr. Jameson's private journal and papers. He has justified so much already that the above will seem but a trifling matter.

Let it not be forgotten, however, that when these men are wholly cleared, Mr. Stanley himself must answer at the bar of public opinion for his cruel accusations of them, for the desertion of the camp at Yambuya, and for his whole conduct with regard to the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition.

Harry Quilter.

# The Wisdom of the Indians.

EVERYBODY knows that in the reign of the Emperor Elagabalus Rome was visited by an embassy from India, whose members, on their way from the East, had held that memorable interview with the illustrious (though heretical) Christian philosopher Bardesanes which enabled him to formulate his doctrine of Fate, borrowed from the Indian theory of Karma, and therefore, until lately, grievously misunderstood by his commentators.

It may not, however, be equally notorious that the ambassadors returned by sea as far as Berytus, and upon landing there were hospitably entertained by the sage Euphronius, the head of the philosophical faculty of that University.

Euphronius naturally enquired what circumstance in Rome had appeared to his visitors most worthy of remark.

'The extreme evil of the Emperor's Karma,' said they.

Euphronius requested further elucidation.

'Karma,' explained their interpreter, 'is that congeries of circumstances which has necessitated the birth of each individual, and whose good or evil is incarnate in him. Every act must needs be attended by consequences, and as these are usually of too far-reaching a character to be exhausted in the life of the doer of the action, they cannot but

engender another person by whom they are to be borne. This truth is popularly expressed by the doctrine of transmigration, according to which individuals, as the character of their deeds may determine, are reborn as pigs or peacocks, beggars or princes. But this is a loose and unscientific way of speaking, for in fact it is not the individual that is reborn, but the character; which, even as the silkworm clothes itself with silk and the caddis worm with mud and small shingle, creates for itself a new personality, congruous with its own nature. We are therefore led to reflect what a prodigious multitude of sins some one must have committed ere the Roman world could be afflicted with such an emperor as Elagabalus.'

'What have ye found so exceedingly reprehensible in the emperor's conduct?' demanded Euphronius.

'To speak only,' said the Indians, 'of such of his doings as may be fitly recited to modest ears, we find him declaring war against Nature, and delighting in nothing that is not the contrary of what Heaven meant it to be. We see him bathing in perfumes, sailing ships in wine, feeding horses on grapes, and lions on parrots, peppering fish with pearls, wearing gems on the soles of his feet, strewing his floor with gold dust, paving the public streets with precious marbles, driving teams of stags, scorning to eat fish by the sea-side, deploring his lot that he has never yet been able to dine on a phœnix. Enormous must have been the folly and wickedness which have incarnated themselves in such a sovereign; and, should his reign be prolonged, discouraging is the prospect for the morals of the next generation.'

'According to you then,' said Euphronius, 'the fates of men are not spun for them by Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos, but by their predecessors?'

'So it is,' said they, 'always remembering that man can rid himself of his Karma by philosophic meditation, combined with religious austerities, and that if all walked in this path, existence with all its evils would come to an end. Insomuch that the most bloodthirsty conqueror that ever devastated the earth hath not destroyed one thousandth part as many existences as the Lord Buddha.'

'These are abstruse matters,' said Euphronius, 'and I lament that your stay in Berytus will not be long enough adequately to instruct me therein.'

'Accompany us to India,' said they, 'and thou shalt receive instruction at the fountain head.'

'I am old and feeble,' apologised Euphronius, 'and adjusted by long habit to my present environment. Nevertheless I will propound the enterprise to my pupils, only somewhat repressing their ardour, lest the volunteers should be inconveniently numerous.'

When, however, the proposition was made, not a soul responded; though Euphronius reproached his disciples severely, and desired them to compare their want of spirit with his own thirst for knowledge, which, when he was a young man, had taken him as far as Alexandria to hear a celebrated rhetorician. In the evening, however, two disciples came to him together, and professed their readiness to undertake the expedition, if promised a reward commensurate with the danger and difficulty.

'Ye would learn the secret of my celebrated dilemma,' said he, 'which no sophist can elude? 'Tis much; 'tis enormous; nevertheless, bring the wisdom of India to Berytus, and the knowledge of the stratagem shall be yours.'

'No, master,' they said, 'it is not thy dilemma of which we are enamoured. It is thy daughter.'

A vehement altercation ensued, but at length the old philosopher, who at the bottom of his heart was much readier to part with his daughter than his dilemma, was induced to promise her to whichever of the pupils should bring home the most satisfactory exposition of Indian metaphysics; provided always that, during their absence, he should not have been compelled to bestow her hand as the price of a quibble even more subtle than his own; but this he believed to be impossible.

Mnesitheus and Rufus accordingly travelled with the embassy to India, and arrived in safety at the metropolis of Palimbothra. They had wisely devoted themselves meanwhile to learning the language, and were able to converse with some fluency.

On reaching their destination they were placed under the superintendence of competent instructors, who were commissioned to initiate them into the canon of the Buddhist scriptures, comprising, to mention only some of the principal, the Lalitavistara, the Dhammapada, the Kuddhapatha, the Patrinokkha, the Uragavagga, the Kularagga, the Mahavagga, the Atthahavagga, and the Upasompadakammavaca. These works, composed in dead languages, and written in strange and unknown characters, were further provided with commentaries more voluminous and inexplicable than the text.

'Heavens,' exclaimed Mnesitheus and Rufus, 'can the life of a man suffice to study all this?'

'Assuredly not,' replied the Indians. 'The diligent student will resume his investigations in a subsequent state of existence, and, if endowed with eminent faculties, may hope to attain the end he proposes to himself at the fifteenth transmigration.'

'The end we propose to ourselves,' said the Greeks, 'is to marry our master's daughter. Will the fair Euphronia have also undergone fifteen transmigrations? and will her charms have continued unimpaired?'

'It is difficult to pronounce,' said they, 'for should the maiden, through the exercise of virtue, have merited to be born as a white elephant, her transmigrations must in the order of nature be but few; whereas, should she have unfortunately become and remained a rat, a frog, or other short-lived animal, they cannot but be exceedingly numerous.'

'The prospect of wedding a frog at the end of fifteen transmigrations,' said the youths, 'doth not in any respect commend itself to us. Are there no means by which the course of study may be accelerated?'

'Undoubtedly,' said the Indians, 'by the practice of religious austerities.'

'Of what nature are these?' inquired the young men.

'The intrepid disciple,' said the sages, 'may chain himself to a tree, and gaze upon the sun until he is deprived of the faculty of vision. He may drive an iron bar through his cheeks and tongue, thus preventing all misuse of the gift of speech. It is open to him to bury himself in the earth up to his breast, relying for his sustenance on the alms of passers-by. He may recline upon a couch studded with spikes, until from the induration of his skin he shall have merited the title of a rhinoceros among sages. As, however, these latter practices interfere with locomotion, and thus prevent his close attendance upon his spiritual guide, it is rather recommended to him to elevate his arms above his head, and retain them in that position until, by the withering and shrinking of the sinews, it is impossible for him to bring them down again.'

'In that case,' cried Rufus, 'farewell philosophy! farewell Euphronia!'

There is reason to believe that Mnesitheus would have made exactly the same observation if Rufus had not been beforehand with him. The spirit of contradiction and the affectation of superiority, however, led him to reproach his rival with pusillanimity, and he went so far that at length he

found himself committed to undergo the ordeal: merely stipulating that, in consideration of his being a foreigner, he should be permitted to elevate the right arm only. The king of the country most graciously came to his assistance by causing him to be fastened to a tree, with his uplifted arm secured by iron bands above his head, a fan being put into his other hand to protect him against the molestation of gnats and mosquitoes. By this means, and with the assistance of the monks who continually visited him and expounded the Buddhist scriptures in his ears, sometime even before his arm had stiffened for ever the doctrine of the misery of existence had become perfectly clear to him.

Released from his captivity, he hastened back to Europe to claim the guerdon of his sufferings. History is silent respecting his adventures until his arrival at Berytus, where the strange wild-looking man with the uplifted arm found himself the centre of a turbulent and mischievous rabble. As he seemed about to suffer severe ill-usage, a personage of dignified and portly appearance hastened up, and with his staff showered blows to right and left upon the rioters.

'Scoundrels!' he exclaimed; 'finely have ye profited by my precepts, thus to misuse an innocent stranger! But I will no longer dwell among such barbarians. I will remove my school to Tarsus!'

The mob dispersed. The victim and his deliverer stood face to face.

'Mnesitheus!'

'Rufus!'

'Call me Rufinianus,' corrected the latter; 'for such is the appellation which I have felt it due to myself to assume since the enhancement of my dignity by becoming Euphronius's successor and son-in-law!'

'Son-in-law! Am I to lose the reward of my incredible sufferings?'

'Thou forgettest,' said Rufinianus, 'that Euphronia's hand was not promised as the reward of any austerities, but as the meed of the most intelligent, that is, the most acceptable, account of the Indian philosophy, which, in the opinion of the late eminent Euphronius, hath been delivered by me. But come to my chamber, and let me minister to thy necessities.'

These having been duly attended to, Rufinianus demanded Mnesitheus's history, and then proceeded to narrate his own.

'On my journey homeward,' said he, 'I reflected seriously on the probable purpose of our master in sending us forth, and I saw reason to suspect that I had hitherto misapprehended it. For I could not remember that

he had ever admitted that he could have anything to learn from other philosophers, or that he had ever exhibited the least interest in philosophic dogmas, excepting his own. The system of the Indians, I thought, must be either inferior to that of Euphronius, or superior. If the former, he will not want it; if the latter, he will want it much less. I therefore concluded that our mission was partly a concession to public opinion; partly to enable him to say that his name was known and his teaching proclaimed on the very banks of the Ganges. I formed my plan accordingly, and, disregarding certain indications that I was neither expected nor wanted, presented myself before Euphronius with a gladsome countenance, slightly overcast by sorrow on account of thee, whom I affirmed to have been devoured by a tiger.

'"Well," said Euphronius in a disdainful tone, "and what of this vaunted wisdom of the Indians?"

'"The wisdom of the Indians," I replied, "is entirely borrowed from Pythagoras."

'"Did I not tell you so?" Euphronius appealed to his disciples.

'"Invariably," they replied.

'"As if a barbarian could teach a Greek!" said he.

'"It is much if he is able to learn from one," said they.

'"Pythagoras," then said Euphronius, addressing me, "did not resort to India to be instructed by the Gymnosophists?"

'"On the contrary," I answered, "he went there to teach them, and the little knowledge of divine matters they possess is entirely derived from him. His mission is recorded in a barbarous poem called the Ramayana, wherein he is figuratively represented as allying himself with monkeys. He is worshipped all over the country under the appellations of Siva, Kamadeva, Kali, Gautama Buddha, and others too numerous to mention."

'When I further proceeded to announce that a temple had been erected to Euphronius himself on the banks of the Ganges, and that a festival, called Durga Pooja, or the Feast of Reason, had been instituted in his honour, his good humour knew no bounds, and he granted me his daughter's hand without difficulty. He died a few years ago, bequeathing me his celebrated dilemma, and I am now head of his school and founder of the Rufinianian philosophy. I am also the author of many admired works, especially a life of Pythagoras, and a manual of Indian philosophy and religion. I hope for thine own sake that thou wilt forbear to

contradict me, for no one will believe thee. I trust also that thou wilt speedily overcome thy disappointment with respect to Euphronia. I do most honestly and truthfully assure thee that for a one-armed man like thee to marry her would be most inexpedient, inasmuch as the defence of one's beard from her, when she is in a state of excitement, requires the full use of both hands, and of the feet also. But come with me to her chamber, and I will present thee to her. She is always taunting me with my inferiority to thee in personal attractions, and I promise myself much innocent amusement from her discomfiture when she finds thee as gaunt as a wolf and as black as a cinder. Only, as I have represented thee to have been devoured by a tiger, thou wilt kindly say that I saved thy life, but concealed the circumstance out of modesty.'

'I have learned in the Indian schools,' said Mnesitheus, 'not to lie for the benefit of others. I will not see Euphronia. I would not disturb her ideal of me; or mine of her. Farewell. May the Rufinianian sect flourish! and may thy works on Pythagoras and India instruct posterity to the tenth generation! I return to Palimbothra, where I am held in honour on the selfsame account that here renders me ridiculous. It shall be my study to enlighten the natives respecting their obligations to Pythagoras, whose name I did not happen to hear while I abode among them.'

R. GARNETT.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES
3 9088 01763 9881